

FOREIGN POLICY UPDATE

Y 4. F 76/2: S. HRG. 103-326

Foreign Policy Update, S.Hrg. 103-3... NG

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 4, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

In Memory of

Marcia McCord Verville

1947-1993



MAR 30 1994

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1993

74-020cc

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-043362-2

FOREIGN POLICY UPDATE

Y 4. F 76/2: S. HRG. 103-326

Foreign Policy Update, S.Hrg. 103-3... NG

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 4, 1993

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

In Memory of

Marcia McCord Verville

1947-1993



MAR 30 1994

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1993

74-020cc

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-043362-2

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN, New York
CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin
HARLAN MATHEWS, Tennessee

JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
NANCY L. KASSEBAUM, Kansas
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska
HANK BROWN, Colorado
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
PAUL COVERDELL, Georgia
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire

GERYLD B. CHRISTIANSON, *Staff Director*
JAMES W. NANCE, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

Christopher, Warren, Secretary of State	Page 2
Prepared statement	7

(III)

FOREIGN POLICY UPDATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1993

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Claiborne Pell (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Pell, Sarbanes, Dodd, Kerry, Simon, Robb, Wofford, Mathews, Helms, Lugar, Kassebaum, Pressler, Murkowski, Brown, Jeffords, Coverdell, and Gregg.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Foreign Relations will come to order. This morning we meet to receive testimony from the Secretary of State on an overview of foreign policy issues. Actually, this is the Secretary's first appearance before Congress since returning from his trip to Europe, and since the extensive congressional debate on the foreign deployment of American troops for peacekeeping purposes.

We look forward to hearing the administration's views on the many pressing foreign policy issues that face our Nation, and welcome this opportunity to begin what promises to be a pretty exhaustive congressional review of the role of the U.S. Armed Forces in the post-cold war world which the majority leader has asked our committee to undertake.

The lessons of Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia have underscored the need for careful examination of the relationship between Congress and the President with respect to the use of force. There has been a lot of debate over the operation of the 1973 War Powers Resolution; over the respective powers of the President and the Congress regarding the use of force outside the United States; and over the lack of specific guidelines for participating in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

These matters need to be reviewed by the Senate in a deliberative manner and in a timeframe allowing for the collective judgment of Congress and the executive branch to clarify our respective roles unimpeded by the heat of the current controversies.

As the committee of jurisdiction over intervention abroad, declaration of war, relations with foreign nations generally, we will work together on the committee to conduct such a review.

I will now turn to the ranking Republican member present, Senator Kassebaum.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will save most of my comments for question time and look forward to hearing Mr. Secretary.

I would only add that it is a very important time for the administration to speak with a clear voice on foreign policy. I think, Mr. Secretary, this gives an important opportunity to you to help us understand exactly what the administration's views are on a number of very important issues. We certainly welcome your being here this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Kassebaum. Secretary Christopher, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. WARREN CHRISTOPHER, SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to be here today to talk to you about the strategic priorities of American foreign policies.

The world is moving away from one of the most dangerous confrontations in history, and in that fact lies tremendous opportunity for the United States.

In the cold war world, stability was based upon confrontation. In the new world, stability will be based upon common interests and shared values. My job as the Secretary of State is to help the President guide the country through this transition. I welcome that challenge.

At the same time, I understand we must accomplish this transition, this transformation, at a time when the definitions, certainties, and ground rules of the cold war have disappeared. I hasten to add that I have no regrets about the passing of the cold war. Nostalgia for the rigidities can only stem from a kind of amnesia. But its demise does mean that we must develop a new domestic consensus to sustain active engagement in a more complex and interdependent world.

During this period, the United States must maintain a tough-minded sense of our enduring interests, ensuring the security of our Nation, the prosperity of our people, and the advancement where possible of democratic values. And it is with those core interests in mind that the Clinton administration has defined and is pursuing overarching priorities of American foreign policy.

We are renewing and updating our key security alliances while also building on the historically unique situation that the major powers can be partners cooperating for peace. We are working to contain and resolve regional conflicts, particularly where the threat of expansion or the risk of proliferation poses a direct danger to the United States.

The United States is working relentlessly to ensure that an ever-increasing number of people know the benefits of democratic institutions, human rights, and a free market. We are working to expand trade, spur growth, and to enhance the economic security of every American.

In this period of transition, crises or even setbacks are inevitable. We will work to prevent and manage them, but we will stay steady and we will keep on responsible courses that we have set for America.

Television is a wonderful phenomenon and sometimes even an instrument of freedom, but television images cannot be the North Star of U.S. foreign policy.

Today, I would like to discuss with the committee our efforts with respect to several major issues of enduring national interest. These are not the exclusive concern for this administration. My speeches last spring to the Council of America and the African-American Institute described our policy objectives toward Latin America and Africa respectively.

Today, I want to discuss in my testimony some of our current top priorities, priorities that address the great challenges of this era. This is my job on a day-to-day basis. This is what I do when I come to work, address these strategic priorities.

First, economic security. Security in the post-cold war era will depend as much on strong economies as on a strong arsenal. This administration understands that America's strength at home and strength abroad are interlocking and are mutually reinforcing. That is why President Clinton and I have placed economic policy at the heart of our foreign policy. I believe that this new emphasis is already yielding important results.

Three events all occurring within the next 40 days will help determine the strength of our economy and the standard of living for our people as we enter the 21st century. These events are the NAFTA vote, the decision on the Uruguay Round and GATT, and the APEC meeting in Seattle.

By approving NAFTA the United States will send a powerful signal that we support democracy and open markets throughout this hemisphere. Rejecting NAFTA would send a chilling signal at a time when so many of our neighbors, including Mexico, are genuinely receptive to closer cooperation with us.

NAFTA is now in our hands, but the United States cannot conclude the Uruguay Round of the GATT negotiations on our own. I want to remind our allies and trading partners in Europe, remind them once again that advancing trans-Atlantic security requires not only that we focus on renewing the NATO Alliance, but on successfully concluding the GATT negotiations.

Nowhere is economic growth faster or export opportunities for American business greater than in the dynamic Asia-Pacific region. The APEC conference in Seattle later this month, and the historic gathering of leaders that President Clinton has called for at the conclusion of that conference, those events will enable us to establish a framework for regional cooperation and trade liberalization throughout the Pacific Rim.

These 40 days can shape the economic world and shape America's future as we look forward to a new role in Asia. With NAFTA, GATT, and APEC there is an extraordinary convergence of opportunities for the United States.

Our second priority is support for reform in Russia and the new independent states. We are placing special emphasis on our support for political and economic reform in Russia, in Ukraine and the other states of the former Soviet Union, and the new democracies for central and eastern Europe. President Clinton is seeking to build a strategy alliance with postcommunist reformers throughout this area.

I went to Moscow 2 weeks ago, as the chairman said, to reaffirm our steadfast support for reform in the wake of the early October crisis in Russia. President Yeltsin and Foreign Minister Kozyrev

reiterated their commitment to reform and their determination to hold free and fair elections in December, and to allow press freedom.

My visit gave me renewed confidence that reform will prevail once again. I now look forward to a January summit between President Clinton and President Yeltsin, a summit we expect will broaden and deepen the new cooperative relationship we are forging.

A third priority is Europe and NATO. The trip I completed last week was also designed to renew the NATO Alliance at a time of new and different security challenges in Europe. The Alliance must embrace innovation or risk irrelevance. The United States is proposing to transform NATO's relationship with the new democracies of the East.

The January summit should formally open the door to an evolutionary process of NATO expansion. The process should be non-discriminatory and inclusive, and should not be tied to a specific timetable or criteria for membership.

The summit should also initiate practical military cooperation between NATO forces and those of the East. To that end we proposed a partnership for peace open to all members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council as well as others.

A fourth priority is Asia and the Pacific. The Asia-Pacific region contains the world's most dynamic economies, and it is the most lucrative terrain for American exports and jobs. It is thus crucial to the President's domestic agenda.

The upcoming APEC meeting will elaborate on the President's vision of a new Pacific community. The basic outlines of this community are already clear. A more prosperous community through open markets and open societies, a more secure community through the maintenance of our alliances and forward military presence, non-proliferation policies, engagement in regional dialog, a freer community through advocacy of open society, and regional cooperation on global issues.

The cornerstone of our Asia-Pacific policy remains our relationship with Japan. The President seeks to shape a durable and comprehensive partnership. We need to place our economic ties on as sound and cooperative a basis as we have established on security, political, and global issues.

We are establishing a comprehensive relationship with China, a relationship that permits resolution of differences in a broad strategic context. We are working to make strides in all areas of continuing concern with China including human rights, nonproliferation, and market access. We share with the Congress the need to make measurable progress. The clock is ticking. Unless there is overall significant progress on human rights the President will not be in a position to recommend extension of MFN next spring.

A fifth priority is the Middle East. The Middle East is a region where the United States has both vital interests and the influence to protect those interests. The recent breakthrough between the Israelis and the Palestinians has fundamentally changed the landscape of Arab-Israeli conflict. There is much work to be done to transform the declaration of principles into an enduring agreement and changed realities on the ground.

It is absolutely essential that the Israelis and the Palestinians implement their declaration in a timely manner. That will show that negotiations work, and it will demonstrate that extremists cannot stop the march toward peace.

The Israelis and Palestinians need to be flexible and patient as they work through the complicated issues on the table, and the international community needs to lend its support.

It is also essential that we continue our efforts to move toward a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. This means ensuring that there is progress on the other tracks and that progress on the Israeli-Palestinian track will facilitate rather than impede the movement and progress on the other tracks.

Anachronisms such as the Arab boycott and anti-Israeli U.N. resolutions that have been on the books for far too long must both be removed. There has been some movement on both of these issues and we are working to build greater momentum.

We are committed to doing everything we can to help secure what has been achieved and to push for breakthroughs on other fronts. There is much work to be done, but I am very hopeful about the prospects for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

A sixth priority is nonproliferation. The peace process must be accompanied by efforts to stem the spread of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East as well as in other regions. Proliferation of nuclear weapons is the most serious security threat in the post-cold war era.

This administration is working for global enforcement of nonproliferation standards. We are pursuing specific strategies in each region where there are real risks of proliferation—the Middle East, the Korean peninsula, Persian Gulf, south Asia, Russia, and the new independent states.

Last week I returned from visiting Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus where hundreds of old Soviet nuclear weapons remain. In 1992 those states committed themselves to ratify the START I Treaty and to adhere to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as nonnuclear states. Belarus has already done so. Kazakhstan has ratified START I and has now set a deadline for accession to the NPT, a deadline of the end of this year.

Ukraine has reaffirmed its commitments and their applicability to all strategic offensive weapons on Ukrainian soil, but we still have hard work ahead with Ukraine, where the opposition remains very serious in its statement that that nation would not become nonnuclear.

The United States is prepared to help Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus with their denuclearization and economic assistance, but we have made it clear that cooperation on denuclearization and nonproliferation is a prerequisite to longer term economic cooperation and security partnership.

Let me say a few words about regional conflicts. The end of the cold war, while lifting the lid that has smothered freedom for so much of the world, has also lifted the lid on regional conflicts. Some of them touch our interests or will if they are not checked, but other conflicts, other regional conflicts may not.

Clearly, we need to consider new mechanisms for conflict resolution and avoidance, as well as modifying or creating new mecha-

nisms for peacekeeping. Our own role will be informed by a strict assessment of our interests and the interests of others.

That is what we are doing today in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia. These are difficult situations, and some setbacks are inevitable. We should learn from them, but we should not overreact because that might mean losing possible opportunities for progress or damaging our interests elsewhere.

Haiti demonstrates that temporary setbacks must not prevent us from pursuing our interests. If democracy is not restored in Haiti repression, violence, and suffering will continue causing large numbers of Haitians to flee often at great risk to themselves and to Haiti's neighbors, and I think often at great pressure on U.S. immigration policy.

Haiti's problems can only be addressed through democratic institutions and economic development. We have supported a political process culminating in the Governor's Island accord, a process to allow democratically elected President Aristide of Haiti to return. But now Haiti's military leadership refuses to adhere to the accord that they themselves signed and agreed to.

We are staying on course in Haiti. We remain committed to the restoration of democracy and the return of President Aristide. We have now reimposed sanctions on oil and arms, and a freeze on assets of a small group of targeted individuals, and we are prepared to increase our pressures on the Haitian military if that turns out to be necessary.

In Somalia the United States is pursuing a noble objective, consistent with our values and traditions. We have saved literally hundreds of thousands of lives. We are now firmly set on a political track, and we are encouraged by the progress that has been made.

In order to give this process a chance to succeed American forces will remain until next March and will, as President Clinton said on October 7, work with U.N. forces to open the lines of communication and keep pressure on those who would cut off our relief supplies.

We could have simply abandoned the efforts in Somalia after the tragic death of servicemen on October 3. We chose instead to protect the real gains made in Somalia while improving the prospects for future progress.

American policy toward the terrible conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina responds to our strategic interest in preventing the conflict from spreading to neighboring countries, and our humanitarian interest in helping to relieve the suffering people of Bosnia. Negotiations offer the only way to a practical solution.

Although the Geneva talks have not been able to produce an acceptable agreement they have made some progress and remain alive. We will continue to press the negotiating track, but with the Bosnian people at serious risk this winter we must focus our attention on humanitarian relief. That includes providing the airlift and airdrop support that has been a critical development and a critical element in our relief effort.

We support the work of the U.N. War Crimes Tribunal, and we support continued economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro. At the same time, the United States has made it clear

in statements by its President and by me that we will not attempt to force a settlement on Bosnia militarily.

If, however, we are satisfied with the conditions for our participation, we would be prepared to participate in a NATO implementation, a Bosnian settlement if it was agreed to by all parties and implementation were to begin.

I want to assure the members of this committee that our policy toward any regional conflict will undergo constant and rigorous evaluation. Any situation in which American men and women could be put in harms way will always hold the highest priority for me and for every member of our administration.

Mr. Chairman, this administration is committed to frequent and comprehensive consultations with Congress. When congressional hearings begin soon on the relationship between the legislative and executive branches we will be responsive. It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, a spirit of cooperation and steadfastness about enduring American interests in a fast changing world that I have come here today.

Mr. Chairman, I have filed with the committee a longer statement, and I ask that that be made a part of the record. I have tried to shorten my statement to allow maximum time for your questions. I will be glad now to hear questions and comments.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Christopher follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SECRETARY CHRISTOPHER

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk to you today about the strategic priorities of America's foreign policy.

The world is moving away from one of the most dangerous confrontations in history, and in that fact lies tremendous opportunity for the United States. In the Cold War world, stability was based on confrontation. In the new world, stability will be based on common interests and shared values.

We stand on the brink of shaping a new world of extraordinary hope and opportunity. While I relish the challenge of what lies before us, I am also mindful that the new world we seek will not emerge on its own. We must shape the transformation that is underway in a time of great fluidity.

My job as Secretary of State is to help the President guide the country through this transition. I welcome that challenge.

At the same time, I understand that we must accomplish this transformation at a time when the definitions, certainties, and ground rules of the Cold War have disappeared. I hasten to add that I have no regrets about the passing of the Cold War. Nostalgia for its rigidities can only stem from amnesia. But its demise does mean that we must develop a new domestic consensus to sustain our active engagement in a more complex and interdependent world.

During this period, the United States must maintain a tough-minded sense of our enduring interests: ensuring the security of our nation; the prosperity of our people; and the advancement, where possible, of our democratic values. And it is with those core interests in mind that the Clinton Administration has defined and is pursuing the overarching priorities of America's foreign policy.

We are renewing and updating our key security alliances, while also building on the historically unique situation that the major powers can be partners cooperating for peace—not competitors locked in conflict. We must reach out to former adversaries to transform them into partners. We are working to contain and resolve regional conflicts, particularly where the threat of expansion or the risk of proliferation poses a very direct danger to the United States. And we are working to expand trade, spur growth, and enhance the economic security of each and every American.

We can shape the future knowing that the United States is more secure now than at any time since early in this century. Democracy is ascendant from Central America to Central Asia, from South Africa to Cambodia. Free markets are being established in places where they were long forbidden. Millions of people, for the first time in their lives, have the chance to enjoy political freedom and economic opportunity. The United States is working relentlessly to ensure that an ever-increasing number

of people know the benefits of democratic institutions, human rights, and free markets.

At the same time, new threats to peace and stability have emerged. The unholy marriage of ethnic violence and aggressive nationalism is shattering fragile states, creating humanitarian tragedies and raising the possibility of wider regional strife. And the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction multiplies the danger of every conflict.

In this period of transition, crises and even setbacks are inevitable. We will work to prevent and manage them. But we will stay on the steady and responsible course we have set. Television is a wonderful phenomenon and sometimes even an instrument of freedom. But television images cannot be the North Star of America's foreign policy.

As I travel the world, I see that virtually every nation wants to define its foreign policy in terms relative to the United States, whether seeking security assurances or expanding trade and investment links with us. They look to us as the fulcrum for global security and, in many cases, for regional security. They know that American international leadership is in *their* interest. This gives us unparalleled opportunities to influence their conduct. I am here today to say that American engagement and leadership in the world—that an activist American foreign policy—is most fundamentally in *our* interest.

PRIORITIES

Today I would like to discuss with this Committee our efforts with respect to several major issues of enduring national interest. These are not the exclusive areas of concern for this Administration. My speeches last spring to the Council of the Americas and the African American Institute described our policy objectives toward Latin America and Africa, respectively. Today I want to discuss in my testimony some of our current top priorities—priorities that address the great challenges in this era of change. Let me begin with the new centrality of economic policy in our foreign policy.

1. *Economic Security*

Security in the post-Cold War era will depend as much on strong economies as on strong arsenals. This Administration understands that America's strength at home and its strength abroad are interlocking—and mutually reinforcing. That is why President Clinton and I have placed economic policy at the heart of our foreign policy. And I believe that this new emphasis is already yielding results.

The President's approach was apparent at the successful July summit meeting of the G-7 nations in Tokyo. For more than a decade, our major industrial allies and trading partners complained that we were not serious about reducing the growth of our budget deficit. By working with the Congress to enact a historic deficit reduction program, President Clinton sent a clear message to the world: America is back as a responsible manager of its own economy and as a dependable leader for global economic cooperation and growth.

Armed with that new credibility in Tokyo, President Clinton won a market access agreement to move the Uruguay Round forward. He was also able to win new pledges for multilateral assistance to Russia, and an agreement to negotiate a new economic framework to correct our unacceptable trade imbalance with Japan. This Administration attaches as high a priority to improving our economic and trade ties with Japan as it does to maintaining our important security and political links.

Let me briefly turn your attention to three events—all occurring within the next 40 days—that together will help determine the strength of our economy and the standard of living of our people as we enter the 21st century: the vote on NAFTA, the deadline for GATT, and the meeting of the APEC forum. Each event is also a foreign policy challenge with enormous consequences for our global leadership.

I have been making the case for NAFTA repeatedly in recent weeks, and I believe that there is increasing recognition that NAFTA is one of the great foreign policy opportunities of this generation. For the United States, Canada and Mexico, NAFTA is about more than tariffs and trade, growth and jobs. It will also build a new cooperative relationship with Mexico. Approval of NAFTA will increase Mexico's capacity to cooperate with us on a wide range of vital issues such as illegal immigration, cross-border pollution and narco-trafficking.

NAFTA will also mark a turning point in the history of our relations throughout the hemisphere at a time when democracy is on the march, markets are opening and conflicts are being resolved peacefully. By approving NAFTA, the United States will send a powerful signal that we support these developments. Rejecting NAFTA, on the other hand, would send a chilling signal about our willingness to engage in

Latin America at a time when so many of our neighbors—including Mexico—are genuinely receptive to closer cooperation with us.

There is no good time to defeat NAFTA—but there could be no worse time than when the GATT negotiations are in their final crucial days leading up to the December 15 deadline. At this delicate, decisive stage of the Uruguay Round, the United States must maintain maximum leverage—and exercise maximum leadership. A setback on NAFTA would compromise both. Rejecting NAFTA would create the perception that America is not prepared to act on behalf of its global economic interests at a time when those interests are so clearly at stake.

NAFTA is now in our hands, but the United States cannot conclude the Uruguay Round on its own. The EC, Japan, the ASEAN nations, and others must also move. None of the remaining trade-offs in goods, services or agriculture will be easy for any nation—but they must be made. I want to remind our allies and trading partners in Europe once again that advancing transatlantic security requires us not only to focus on renewing the NATO Alliance but also on successfully concluding the GATT negotiations. The Uruguay Round is critically important to the revival of the world economy, not only to our major industrial allies, but to developing countries in Africa, Latin America, and Asia that are seeking sustained growth and sustainable development.

Nowhere is economic growth faster—or the export opportunities for American business greater—than in the dynamic Asia-Pacific region. In two weeks, I will go to Seattle to host a meeting of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum. The APEC conference—and the historic gathering of leaders that President Clinton has called at its conclusion—will enable us to establish a framework for regional economic integration and trade liberalization among 15 economies that now account for nearly half the world's GNP. It will expand America's economic presence in a region to which our future is increasingly linked.

These are 40 days that can shake the economic world and shape America's future position in it. With NAFTA, GATT, and APEC, there is an extraordinary convergence of opportunities for the United States. I view each of these challenges, along with the President's deficit reduction program and successes in Tokyo last summer, as integral elements of the most ambitious international economic agenda that any President has undertaken in almost half a century. And as Secretary of State, I see each as a foreign policy as well as an economic policy opportunity—because in the post-Cold War world, our national security is inseparable from our economic security.

2. Support for Reform in Russia and the NIS

This Administration is placing special emphasis on our support for political and economic reform in Russia and in the other states of the former Soviet Union. Helping ensure the success of this process is our highest foreign policy priority. That is the reason President Clinton is seeking to build a strategic alliance with post-communist reformers throughout the area.

If the people of Russia succeed in their heroic struggle to build a free society and a market economy, the payoffs for the United States will be transforming: a permanently diminished threat of nuclear war; lower defense budgets; vast new markets; and cooperation on the global and regional issues that once divided us. Helping democracy prevail in Russia remains the wisest—and least expensive—investment that we can make in America's security.

Mr. Chairman, the House and Senate have recognized the value of this investment. With the support of Congress, the United States initially pledged \$1.6 billion in bilateral assistance programs to Russia and the New Independent States. In Tokyo last July, we proposed a \$3 billion special privatization and restructuring program, which our G-7 partners have joined. And in late September, as the crisis in Moscow between reform and reaction was approaching its climax, this Congress approved the Administration's request for \$2.5 billion in additional technical and humanitarian assistance.

As you know, I went to Moscow two weeks ago to reaffirm, on behalf of President Clinton, our steadfast support for reform in the wake of the early October crisis. I made the case that the credibility of December's parliamentary elections—and the prospects for Russian democracy—depend on open dissent and a free press. President Yeltsin and Foreign Minister Kozyrev reiterated their commitment to reform and their determination to hold free and fair elections—and to allow press freedom.

Despite the hardships inevitably associated with a transformation of this magnitude, the Russian people have chosen reform over reaction. My visit gave me renewed confidence that reform will win their support once again. We now look forward to a January summit between President Clinton and President Yeltsin in Mos-

cow—a summit that we expect will broaden and deepen the new cooperative relationship we are forging.

3. *Europe and NATO*

The trip I completed last week was designed not only to reinforce our partnership with Russia, but to help renew the NATO alliance at a time of new and different security challenges in Europe. The United States has an enduring political, military, economic and cultural link to Europe that must be preserved. The European Community is our largest single trading partner, and we have a powerful stake in the collective security guaranteed by NATO. This Alliance of democracies—the most successful in history—can lay the foundation of an undivided continent rooted in the principles of political liberty and economic freedom.

To meet the new challenges in Europe, the Alliance must embrace innovation, or risk irrelevance. Accordingly, the United States is proposing to transform NATO's relationship with the new democracies of the East.

The January summit should formally open the door to an evolutionary process of NATO expansion. This process should be non-discriminatory and inclusive. It should not be tied to a specific timetable or criteria for membership.

The summit should also initiate practical military cooperation between NATO forces and those to the East. To that end, we have proposed a Partnership for Peace. The Partnership would be open to all members of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council as well as others. It excludes no nations and forms no new blocs.

Our idea is to build the Partnership for Peace over time, at a pace geared to each Partner's interest and capabilities. The Partnership would involve tangible cooperation and would channel members' defense efforts toward the ability to participate with NATO in a range of multinational missions. This Partnership for Peace would play an important role in the evolutionary process of NATO expansion, creating an evolving security relationship that could culminate in NATO membership.

This Partnership is a first step by the Alliance to help fill the vacuum of insecurity and instability that was created in Central and Eastern Europe by the demise of the Soviet empire. It reflects our strong belief that the reform movements in Eastern Europe must be bolstered by the prospect of security cooperation with the West. Reaction to this proposal has been positive—from Allies, from NATO Secretary General Woerner, from Central and East European countries (including the Baltic States) and from Russia and the New Independent States.

4. *Asia and the Pacific*

No area of the world will be more important for American interests than the Asia-Pacific region. This region contains the world's most dynamic economies, and it is the most lucrative terrain for American exports and jobs. It is thus crucial to the President's domestic agenda. We have vital security stakes in an area where we have fought three wars in the past half-century and where major powers intersect. And we seek to promote our values in the world's most populous region, where democracy is on the move yet repressive regimes remain.

The stakes in Asia are therefore high for America. That is why President Clinton travelled there on his first trip overseas. That is why I have been there three times as Secretary.

The upcoming APEC meeting will elaborate the President's vision of a New Pacific Community which he set forth in July in his statements in Tokyo and Seoul. The basic outlines are already clear:

- A more prosperous community through open markets and open societies.
- A more secure community through maintenance of our alliances and forward military presence, non-proliferation policies, and engagement in regional dialogues.
- A freer community through advocacy of open societies which contribute both to development and peace.
- Regional cooperation on global issues like the environment, narcotics, refugees and health problems.

The Clinton Administration is placing special emphasis on developing regional approaches so as to construct—with others—a New Pacific Community. But clearly bilateral ties are also part of this vision. Let me briefly mention two that are central to our concerns.

The cornerstone of our Asia-Pacific policy remains our relationship with Japan. The President seeks to shape a durable and comprehensive partnership as we head toward the next century. As I have emphasized, we need to place our economic ties on as sound and cooperative a basis as we have established on security, political and global issues.

We are working out a comprehensive relationship with China that permits resolution of differences in a broad strategic context. As I have made clear on previous occasions, we have continuing concerns with China, including human rights, proliferation, and market access. We are actively working to make strides in each area, and share with the Congress the need to make measurable progress. The clock is ticking on next Spring's decision on MFN renewal. Unless there is overall significant progress on human rights, the President will not be in a position to recommend extension.

5. *The Middle East*

The Middle East is a region where the United States has both vital interests and the influence to protect those interests. This fact was powerfully demonstrated in our successful leadership in stemming aggression in the Persian Gulf. Nowhere is this intersection between interests and influence more apparent than in the Arab-Israeli peace process. For four decades we have been involved in the search for Middle East peace not only because it is the right thing to do, but because our interests and those of our friends demand it. The pursuit of peace cannot guarantee stability in the region. But it can reduce the dangers of war and enhance the well-being of our allies—Israeli and Arab alike. This in turn will help preserve our political and economic stake in one of the world's most important strategic regions.

In the Middle East, the recent breakthrough between Israelis and Palestinians has fundamentally changed the landscape of the Arab-Israeli conflict. There is much work to be done to transform the Declaration of Principles into an enduring agreement and changed realities on the ground.

The challenge now is to reinforce this breakthrough and broaden it to achieve a comprehensive settlement that will last. We will continue to work very closely with the parties themselves in pursuit of three goals.

First, it is essential that Israelis and Palestinians implement their Declaration of Principles in a timely manner. Implementing the accord will build the strength of the peace constituencies. It will show that negotiations work and demonstrate that extremists cannot stop the march toward peace. This accord must succeed. This means that Israelis and Palestinians need to be flexible and patient as they work through the complicated issues on the table. It also means that the international community needs to lend its support. That effort began with the October 1 Conference to Support Middle East Peace, which we organized. It will continue this week in Paris when the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee meets to coordinate assistance to Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. We must work to make the recent turning point for peace irreversible, as we work to make the benefits of peace irresistible.

Second, it is also essential that we continue our efforts to move toward a comprehensive settlement. This means ensuring that progress is achieved on the other tracks, and that progress on the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations facilitates rather than impedes movement on the others. On the Israeli-Syrian track, there are complex issues relating to peace, withdrawal, and security that continue to separate the parties. These issues should be amenable to a negotiated settlement, and we are prepared to play our role as a peace partner with both the Israelis and Syrians. Israelis and Lebanese are focused on trying to find a way to meet their respective needs on the same three issues. And Jordan and Israel, having concluded a historic agenda in Washington, are in the process of organizing their negotiations in a practical manner on key issues.

We are committed to a comprehensive settlement, and we believe the parties are, too. Our Special Middle East Coordinator, Dennis Ross, came back from his recent trip to the region with the strong view that all parties are committed to this process and to working with us to find ways to overcome the gaps that separate them. And we will be unflagging in this effort.

Third, we are trying to create the proper environment for peace in the region. As the implementation of the Declaration of Principles moves forward, we are encouraging Israelis and Palestinians to reach out toward one another and create an atmosphere on the ground that facilitates their work at the negotiating table. At the same time, we are asking the Arab states to do their share. Tunisia's decision to host the refugee working group last month was significant, as was the Qatari Foreign Minister's meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Peres. Oman has offered to host the next working group meeting on water. Egypt will host the next working group meeting on the environment. Morocco hosted Prime Minister Rabin on his return from the September 13 signing ceremony in Washington. Arab and Israeli business people are talking about translating the potential for regional economic growth into reality.

But more needs to be done. Anachronisms such as the Arab boycott of Israel must end, and anti-Israeli UN resolutions that have been on the books for too long must be removed. There has been some movement on both of these issues, and we will work to build greater momentum.

Working at times as a catalyst, as a facilitator, or as a source of reassurance—and, when needed, as an intermediary—the United States is committed to doing everything we can to help secure what has been achieved and push for breakthroughs on other fronts. The President and I will stay actively involved. I will travel to the region when appropriate to promote the sustained progress that I believe is within reach. There is much work to be done, but I am very hopeful about the prospects for a comprehensive peace.

6. Non-Proliferation and Other Global Issues

Nuclear weapons give rogue states disproportionate power, destabilize entire regions, and threaten human and environmental disasters. They can turn local conflicts into serious threats to our security. In this era, weapons of mass destruction are more readily available—and there are fewer inhibitions on their use.

This Administration is working for global enforcement of non-proliferation standards. We are also pursuing specific strategies in each region where there is a real potential for proliferation. We lead the international effort to persuade North Korea to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to its nuclear safeguards obligations. We are working to ensure that Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons, and that Iraq does not restore its former capabilities. We have sanctioned China and Pakistan for China's transfer of ballistic missile components to Pakistan.

Let me describe the progress made on non-proliferation and denuclearization during my trip to Russia and the NIS. I visited Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus, where hundreds of old Soviet nuclear weapons remain. In 1992, these former Soviet states committed themselves to ratify the START I treaty and adhere to the NPT as non-nuclear states. We have taken significant steps forward. Belarus has already fulfilled its commitments. In Kazakhstan, which has ratified START I, President Nazarbayev for the first time set a deadline for accession to the NPT—the end of this year.

Ukraine reaffirmed its commitments and their applicability to all strategic offensive arms on Ukrainian soil. President Kravchuk has pledged to press the Ukrainian parliament to ratify START I during its November session. We still have hard work ahead with Ukraine, where opposition remains to that nation becoming “non-nuclear.”

The United States is prepared to help Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus to destroy or dismantle their nuclear weapons. But we have made it clear that action on these matters is a pre-requisite to longer-term economic cooperation and security partnerships.

We are also bringing transnational issues such as the environment, population growth, refugees, terrorism, and narcotics where they belong—in the mainstream of American foreign policy. If we ignore these issues, they will return—compounded, more costly, and sometimes threatening to our security. That is why the United States is a leader, not a laggard, on global environmental issues. As part of this commitment, we have signed the biodiversity and climate change treaties. This Administration is placing an unmistakable emphasis on these pressing global concerns.

REGIONAL CONFLICTS

Earlier I noted that the end of the Cold War, while lifting the lid that had smothered freedom for much of the world, also lifted the lid on regional conflicts—especially along the periphery of the former Soviet Union. Troublesome conflicts, often spilling across borders, have persisted in Africa. In these conflicts, preventive diplomacy can be employed to great success.

Realism must guide U.S. policies toward these conflicts. Some touch our interests—or will, if they are not checked. But we must accept that other conflicts may not.

In testifying before the Committee, Madeleine Albright addressed the importance of taking stock together with the Congress as we look at regional conflicts and the ever-increasing demands on peacekeeping. Ambassador Albright spoke eloquently of the need to preserve a bipartisan consensus as we address our role in UN peacekeeping operations. I completely agree.

Clearly, we will need to consider new mechanisms for conflict resolution and conflict avoidance. The UN structure may have to be supplemented by regional mechanisms. Organizations such as the OAU and the OAS can be more effective in conflict prevention, peacekeeping, and disaster relief. Institutions like NATO may need to assume more of a peacekeeping mission, at least in Europe. Our own role and in-

volvement will need to be informed by a strict assessment of our interests and the interests of others. We must examine every case—asking rigorous questions, and giving measured answers—to find the course commensurate with our interests.

That is what we are doing today in Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia. In each of these places, things have not always gone exactly as we had planned or hoped. These are difficult situations, and some setbacks, unfortunately, are inevitable. We should learn from them. But we should not overreact, for that may mean either losing possible opportunities for success or damaging our interests elsewhere.

Haiti

Haiti demonstrates that temporary setbacks must not prevent us from pursuing our interests. If democracy is not restored, repression, violence, and suffering will continue. More instability may cause large numbers of Haitians to flee, at great risk to themselves and to Haiti's neighbors—including the United States.

Haiti's problems can be addressed only through democratic institutions and economic development. We have supported a political process, culminating in the Governor's Island accord, that provides for the restoration of democracy. But now Haiti's military leadership refuses to adhere to the accord.

We are staying on course. We remain committed to the restoration of democracy and the return of President Aristide. The sanctions imposed in June brought the Haitian military to the negotiating table. We have now re-imposed sanctions on oil and arms, and a freeze on assets of targeted individuals. These are selective sanctions, designed to compel the military leadership to fulfill its obligations, while sparing, as much as possible, the people of Haiti. We are prepared to increase the pressures on the Haitian military, if that is necessary. Once the accord is implemented, we want to make it possible for Haiti to sustain democracy.

Somalia

The United States is pursuing a noble objective in Somalia, consistent with its finest values and traditions. We have saved literally hundreds of thousands of lives. After the attack on Pakistani peacekeepers in June, significant efforts and resources were dedicated to the military and security aspects of the mission. Not enough attention was given to efforts to achieve political reconciliation, which is essential to prevent Somalia from returning to famine and anarchy. We are now set firmly on the political track and are encouraged by the progress being made. In order to give this process a chance to succeed, American forces will remain until next March and will, as President Clinton stated on October 7, work with UN forces to keep open lines of communications and keep pressure on those who would seek to cut off relief supplies.

To be sure, we could have taken the easy, and perhaps popular, way out: simply abandon the effort in Somalia after the tragic deaths of American servicemen on October 3. The President chose another path, one that seeks to protect the real gains made in Somalia while improving the prospects for further progress. This will give the Somalis a reasonable chance to sort out their differences and also permit the United Nations to prepare for our departure.

Bosnia

American policy toward the terrible conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina responds to our strategic interest in preventing the conflict from spreading to neighboring countries and our humanitarian interest in helping to relieve the suffering of the people of Bosnia.

Negotiations offer the only way to a practical solution. Although the Geneva talks have not been able to produce an acceptable agreement, they have made some progress and remain alive. The negotiators have also explored the option of a "global solution" that would embrace Croatia, Kosovo, and other areas of conflict in the region. The United States has played an active role in support of these diplomatic efforts and will continue to do so.

Unfortunately, none of these efforts provides any assurance that an agreement can be reached this winter. We will continue to press the negotiating track, but with the Bosnian people again at serious risk, we must focus attention on humanitarian relief. The United States has worked very hard to respond to humanitarian needs. We are the single largest country donor of humanitarian aid (more than \$370 million since 1991). With 6,000 flights over 500 days, the Sarajevo airlift has gone on longer than the Berlin airlift of 45 years ago. Airdrops of humanitarian relief to the enclaves have delivered more than 10 million meals since February. American planes have made 80 percent of airdrop flights. We remain committed to the relief effort, both by air and overland, where we are working with the UN and EC on ways to resolve immediate problems of secure land access for relief convoys, now suspended because of intense fighting in central Bosnia.

We strongly support the work of the UN's War Crimes Tribunal, and continued economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro. We are determined to prevent the conflict from spreading, and we have deployed U.S. forces to Macedonia as part of an international effort to deter a wider conflict.

At the same time, the President has made it clear that the United States will not attempt to force a settlement on Bosnia militarily. No imposed settlement would endure. Before committing American troops anywhere in the world, we must ask a series of rigorous and searching questions. If we are satisfied with the conditions for our participation, we would be prepared to participate in a NATO implementation of a Bosnian settlement. Those conditions would include good-faith agreement to a settlement by all the parties, and evidence of good-faith implementation. Any such action by the United States would require the fullest consultation with Congress.

I want to assure the Members of this Committee that our policy toward any regional conflict will undergo constant and rigorous reevaluation. We will constantly reassess our own assumptions to be sure they are truly validated by events. And any situation in which American men and women may be put in harm's way will always hold the highest priority for me and for every member of this Administration.

CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Mr. Chairman, this Administration is committed to frequent and comprehensive consultations with the Congress. When Congressional hearings begin on the relationship between the Legislative and the Executive Branch on foreign policy, we will be responsive.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman—a spirit of cooperation and steadfastness about enduring American interests in a fast-changing world—that I have come here today. Now I would be pleased to respond to your questions and hear your views.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you for your kindness in shortening the statement and your full statement will be put in the record. I would turn now to the ranking minority member for his statement, and then we will go on with the 10-minute rule for questions starting with me.

Senator HELMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator HELMS. It is good to see you here, finally. I appreciate your finding time to come and visit with this committee.

As you have indicated in your statement, there are serious problems all over the world, and it would have been a little more helpful if this committee could have visited with you a bit more often. But we are glad to see you here this morning.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the streets and highways in this city all seem to be torn up at one time. It reminds me of the foreign policy of this country.

In any case, this past weekend, Mr. Secretary, Mrs. Helms and I drove over to Annapolis with a couple of friends. We do that with some regularity, as often as we can work it in, so that we can attend the Sunday morning services at the Naval Academy's chapel, which strikes me as being a cathedral more than a chapel.

In any case, it is an inspiring experience seeing all those young Americans dressed to the nines in their uniforms, singing the Navy hymn, marching down that long aisle behind the American flag and the Christian flag.

It is an emotional experience, especially when you ponder the words to the Navy hymn, "Eternal Father, strong to save whose arm hath bound the restless way;" we bid it—the mighty ocean deep—and so forth and so on.

If you do not weep when you hear that, you are a pretty stern fellow. It makes you think.

I find myself thinking of those thousands of Americans who this morning are at rest in Arlington National Cemetery and of how many of them gave their lives for no reason at all.

There are very few there, if any, Mr. Secretary, who died for less reason than those Americans whose lives were destroyed at Mogadishu, for they were sent on a useless mission of—what do you call it—nation building, whatever that is.

Now, equally disturbing is that in high places there are some who do not even yet appear to have learned a lesson from Mogadishu.

Then, recently, the matter you discussed with some brevity, the United States tried to land 600 Americans in Haiti where there is absolutely no justification for risking even one American life. I challenge anybody to demonstrate that restoring Aristide to power in Haiti is worth one American life.

So you are bound to stop and think. And Americans, I assure you, are doing this all over this country. Are we so bereft of vision that we must defer to an international community before every foreign policy decision? Are we so insecure in our own decisionmaking process that, even when bad decisions are made—chasing Aideded, trying to land in Haiti, just to name one or two—we are scared off by a few, two-bit, Third World gangsters?

Now one part of what I see as the problem is a growing subservience to multilateralism. The other part is the process, or lack thereof, in the formulation of foreign policy. Now Haiti is the most recent example.

I have been criticized in some circles, particularly in the media, for submitting written questions during confirmation hearings. But, regardless of any criticism, I am going to keep on doing that because that is about the only way you can hope to get an adequate answer to questions. That seems to be the only way to get administration officials on the record.

Let me give you an example.

When I asked your Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs on May 5 if Aristide had endorsed the practice of necklacing, that is, the placing of a bicycle tire or an automobile tire around a victim's neck, dousing it with gasoline, and lighting a horrible fire, what was his reply? Rather sarcastically, it occurred to me, he said I remember reading something in the press that Aristide had made a speech in which it could certainly be interpreted by some people to be condoning necklacing at the very least.

Double talk. Double talk, Mr. Secretary.

When I asked if he would agree with human rights activists that Aristide incited violence when he was in power, his answer was that there might be ample evidence that President Aristide incited intimidating or violent behavior among his followers. Yet, we still talk about putting this guy back in power and using American troops one way or another to do it.

I have to tell you that the people out there in America-land do not agree with anybody who suggests that sort of thing.

Then, on May 20, during his confirmation hearing, your Human Rights Assistant Secretary, Mr. Shattuck, confirmed that, while in power, Aristide did incite riots and that Haiti's freedom of the

press was abridged by violence and intimidation. And yet, we talk about restoring democracy in Haiti.

When, in the hell, Mr. Secretary, did democracy prevail in Haiti?

I am candid, Mr. Secretary, about that and I am candid about this: you knew all of that. You were bound to have known all of that.

It was well-known that Aristide was failing. Yet somebody decided to return him to power at the risk, if necessary, of American lives.

It did not come off because there was enough protest all around to stop there.

I do not often quote a lady named Mary McGrory, but on October 14, she wrote: "Haiti, unlike any other foreign policy problems, is personal with the President. He also has political motivation for doing the right thing. He has told friends that a happy ending there will restore him"—that is to say, Mr. Clinton—"to the graces of the Black Caucus, whose members were outraged by the cashiering of Lani Guinier, who was shot down as the President's choice to head the Human Rights Division at the Justice Department."

All of this is what Mary McGrory said.

He is reported to have said he can't give them back social programs because, "I just don't have the money, but I can give them back Haiti."

Now this probably will be denied at every level. But if Mary McGrory had it right back in October, then the United States will have reached a new low in foreign policy.

Mr. Secretary, were these reports correct? Was the decision to send our ships toward Haiti made by deputy national security advisers, and was that decision made, as President Clinton himself has implied, without his knowledge?

If so, the question presents itself: who is in charge?

I regret to say that many Americans, including many Members of Congress, cannot answer those questions, and when there is a policy, nobody seems to be able to explain it. And if they do explain it, it changes the next day.

A familiar Biblical warning comes to mind: If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?

President Carter, you may recall, was criticized for blowing an uncertain trumpet. But there is nothing in the Bible that I know about about an uncertain saxophone. It may be far worse.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We have heard from the ranking minority member. I think the statements he has made are very strong and will be answered as the hearing goes along.

I would ask my colleagues to limit themselves to 10 minutes each.

I would add here one particular point with regard to the Secretary's appearances before our committee. It should be noted for the record that the Secretary has appeared four times before our committee, not including his 2 days of confirmation hearings.

By contrast, at the same point in the Bush administration, Secretary Baker had appeared only twice before our committee.

In total, the Secretary has testified 12 times before various committees in the House and Senate, including, of course, our own

committee. I do not think this bespeaks an unwillingness to come before us.

I agree that we need to improve the process of consultation, and this comes up also in connection with the majority leader's letter regarding the use of force abroad. I look forward to that being developed.

Now, to turn to substantive points—and I am sure that my colleagues will respond to some of the individual points that are being made by Senator Helms—I noticed in the press today a reference to Russia and what seemed to me a new Brezhnev doctrine. This is where it said, "Russia shifts doctrine on military use."

I was just curious what would be your reaction to that statement, that we are seeing a new Brezhnev doctrine coming into being.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have a chance to comment on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me for interrupting. Also, are there any specific points that the minority member made that you wish to respond to? If so, please do it out of my time, too.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

Let me first comment on the story in this morning's paper.

What we are seeing here is Russia coming to grips with the tremendous changes that have occurred over the past 3 years. Part of this, of course, has been a tremendous reduction in the size of the Russian military. In virtually every category, including the nuclear category, significant cuts have been made.

What we are seeing here is Russian military doctrine trying to catch up with the new reality in Russia. This is a new development, a new doctrine, and, obviously, I am prepared only to give you a very preliminary assessment of it. We will be consulting closely with the Russians on this in the days ahead, but let me give you some preliminary thoughts.

First, on the question of first use of nuclear weapons, which was featured in that story, the Russian Federation has jettisoned—

The CHAIRMAN. Could you pull the microphone a tiny bit closer? Thank you.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER [continuing]. The Russian Federation has jettisoned the old doctrine of "no first use." Frankly, the United States and its allies never took the old Soviet doctrine as a serious indication as to what the U.S.S.R. might actually do with its massive arsenal of nuclear weapons.

In the new doctrine, Russia has said, essentially, that it will not use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear weapons states who are parties to the NPT. In fact, the nuclear doctrine announced in this statement is not very different from our own.

Let me comment on the aspect of it relating to the deployment of Russian troops outside of Russia itself. The new doctrine states that the basic objective is to complete the withdrawal of Russian forces to Russian territory, in other words, to complete their withdrawal from outside of Russia. We welcome this.

The doctrine also makes provision for Russian troops to operate in certain situations, presumably in terms of peacekeeping, along the periphery of the old Soviet Union. Our preliminary understanding is that this new doctrine has a very important proviso, and that is that such operations, that is, operations by the military along

the borders of Russia, will be only in cooperation with the other states involved.

In our diplomatic exchanges with Russia, we have stressed, and the Russians have confirmed, that Russian operations outside of Russia must conform with all international norms. They must particularly conform with the U.N. Charter and the CSCE Final Act. They must respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the other states of the new independent states.

In short, Russia must be part of the solution and not part of the problem with respect to the regional conflicts.

Nothing that we have seen in this new doctrine—and, as I say, we are just beginning to study it—contradicts that crucial principle.

On the Baltics, which was also referred to in that story, Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that it is our understanding that the doctrine includes specific reference to the withdrawal of all Russian troops from the neighboring states. That is good news.

I had assurances during my recent visit to Moscow only about a week ago that the Russian Government is committed to reaching a prompt agreement with both Latvia and Estonia on the withdrawal of Russian troops. It is worth remembering that Russian troops are already out of Lithuania.

Moreover, the Russian Government has reiterated that it does not link the troop withdrawal to the situation involving the ethnic Russians in those Baltic States.

I view Defense Minister Grachev's personal comments on this subject as a reflection of his own personal concerns, which we have heard many times before from him, but not as a change in Russian policy.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I have looked at that new doctrine this morning with a great deal of interest, have spent some time thinking about it, and am glad to have had an opportunity to comment.

If I could, Mr. Chairman, on your time, let me respond to Senator Helms' comments that he wished I had been here earlier.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Helms, and members, I have been on Capitol Hill for meetings with this with Senators 31 times since I have been in office, 12 of them in formal hearings, and 19 of them have been in briefings where I was invited, frequently by the chairman of this committee or the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In addition to that, I have always tried to be available to Senators. I have a rule that I return all calls from Congress within the day. I think most of you know that I live up to that rule. If you want to talk to me, call me up and let me know, and I'll get right back to you.

I did that with Senator Helms on a matter where he was quite right to call me. We have had significant progress based upon his call. But I want you all to know that I realize that I serve the American people and I serve the Congress.

If you want to talk to me, call me up on the telephone because I'll call you right back. My 31 appearances here, I think, in the time since I have been in office, considering the amount of travel that the Secretary of State has to do, has been a good record, one I do not apologize for.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not only correct about returning calls, you are one of the few people to whom I'm put through directly, at the time. So I would concur in what you've said.

Going back to the Ukraine, do you feel that Grachev's statement may have been made because Ukraine has not yet signed up for the NPT and it is a way of pressing them in that direction?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. There is no doubt that Russia is concerned about Ukraine complying with the NPT. We all are. I hope they will adhere to it at an early date. But, more broadly, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a new statement of nuclear doctrine by Russia, just as we are undergoing an interagency review.

I knew it was part of their process when I was in Russia, and I was interested to see it coming out this morning. I think it is to be regarded as generalized in nature.

The CHAIRMAN. In your conversations with Kravchuk, I think you saw him on your last trip?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he seem very dug-in on his position about retaining those nuclear weapons? What was the general impression he gave you?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. The general impression he gave me was that he was prepared to see the nuclear weapons dismantled and destroyed. They signed, in my presence, the so-called Faith and Security Dismantlement Agreement for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons. They are starting to dismantle their SS-19's. In conversations with me, he agreed that the SS-24's were also covered—that is the newest nuclear weapons that they have—were also covered by the Liston accords. He said that they would go forward and seek the ratification of START I.

What was lacking and what is important, Mr. Chairman, is he did not give me any timetable for adhering to the NPT. That is where the difficulty is and that is what we must press on. I do not want to make light of that.

There are some strong echoes in Ukraine of their desire to hold on to their nuclear weapons. I think what we all must make clear to them is that they will not be accepted fully into the community of nations, not be eligible for our full economic assistance, until they adhere to the NPT.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. My time has expired. Senator Helms.

Senator HELMS. Very well.

I want to compliment you and your staff.

I had not finished my statement when a staff member handed me a neatly typed response to me. Now that's what you call good staff work.

The CHAIRMAN. They are excellent.

Senator HELMS. I think you ought to give them a raise.

The CHAIRMAN. I'm sure they do, too.

Senator HELMS. Yes, sir. [General laughter]

Out of your pocket.

When was the last time you were before this committee? I'm not going to argue with you about the 31. I don't know how many times you went to a closed session in the House and so forth. But when was the last time you were before this committee, in this room?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I don't have the date, I'm sure.

Senator HELMS. I'll tell you. It was May 11.

It does not matter how many times you have been up here. What does matter is you canceled out on October 15 and October 19, when all of us needed to know things. But I am not going to argue about that. You have said that you want to consult with us and I am going to take you at your word.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good.

Senator HELMS. So we will end that thing.

Now, I realize that the State Department, or our Government, for that matter, cannot know about every event that is happening in Haiti. It is not fair to expect you to know. But, Mr. Secretary, I have a number of serious questions that I want to ask you which I believe are on the minds of the American people if I am any judge of what they are thinking about with respect to Haiti.

The State Department's 1992 Report on Human Rights stated: "In the case of the killing of Roger Lafontant, the Haitian army officer who was the penitentiary commander at the time of Lafontant's murder claimed in a 1992 discussion with U.S. Government officials to have received a personal telephone call from President Aristide on the evening of September 29, 1991, ordering him to kill Lafontant."

Now that is from the State Department's own official report—quote and unquote.

Is it fair, Mr. Secretary, to assume that you do not dispute this part of that report?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I do not dispute the report. But I do know that President Aristide has denied it.

Senator HELMS. I said this part of the report.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I do not dispute that part of the report.

Senator HELMS. OK.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. But I do know that President Aristide has denied it himself.

Senator HELMS. Well, would you confess to it if a charge was made to it and you had done it? Of course he denied it.

But the State Department, and you were not a part of it then, nobody has disputed this thing. They are just saying well, we have to restore democracy in Haiti. They have not had democracy, and you sure as hell ain't going to get it with Aristide back in power. So you don't dispute that part of it, but you don't confirm it, either. Is that what you are saying?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. That's right.

President Aristide has denied that, Senator Helms. I might also point out to you that the administration of President Bush filed that report and supported the return of President Aristide, just as we do. So they took that into account and, nevertheless, supported his return, based upon the totality of the evidence. That is what we do, too.

Senator HELMS. You are not going to make any points with me about criticizing George Bush's State Department because I criticized that State Department, too.

Now do you believe, in your heart of hearts, that Aristide did order the assassination of his chief political rival, Roger Lafontant? Do you believe that he did or did not?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I do not know. The allegation was made and he has denied it.

Senator HELMS. Well, do you have any credible evidence that anyone other than Aristide ordered that murder?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I have not investigated that particular murder.

Senator HELMS. Have you tried to?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Pardon me?

Senator HELMS. Have you tried to?

I think it is significant to know about this man. Just because he denies something does not give him sainthood.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, we have a lot of information about the situation in Haiti, a lot of information about President Aristide. And, based upon all of that evidence, we think he is worthy of our support.

Senator HELMS. Well, a similar situation exists with respect to a Baptist minister by the name of Silvio Claudet—and I think that is the way you pronounce it. He was one of Aristide's chief political rivals.

Now there is evidence aplenty in the hands of your State Department, in the hands of this Congress, saying that Aristide ordered that killing by necklacing.

Now you do not have any opinion on that one way or another?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I do not know about that episode, Senator.

Senator HELMS. Are you going to try to find out something so that you can have an opinion on it?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I have received a lot of information on this subject and, as I say, we have had the benefit of a good deal of personal contact with President Aristide since he has been here in this country. Based upon that and the totality of the evidence, we think he is worthy of our support.

Senator HELMS. Now you know that Mr. Aristide is a defrocked Catholic priest. You do know that, don't you?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Yes, sir.

Senator HELMS. He has been no friend of the Catholic Church.

I am a Baptist, but I know what he has done to and around the Catholic Church. Let me quote one Catholic priest, Father William Murphy. He said that "Aristide supporters gutted, burned, and destroyed the Vatican Embassy in Port-au-Prince, broke the legs of the priest serving in the embassy," and the 1991 State Department Report on Human Rights provides an almost identical description of Father Murphy's account of it.

Now you still say that well, Aristide has denied that? Is that what you say?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I think the quote you have read, Senator, referred to Aristide's supporters. I would say to you, once again, Senator, that our support for President Aristide is based upon the fact that he won a democratic election in Haiti, which was certified to be an open and free election—

Senator HELMS. So did Hitler.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER [continuing]. With about 70 percent of the votes.

Senator HELMS. So did Hitler.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, we have to base our judgments on the basis of what the democratic processes were in an adjacent country. As I say, based upon that and our own contact with him, why we think he is worthy of our support.

Senator HELMS. Churchill didn't.

There is an ongoing dispute within the administration as to whether the CIA has its facts straight. Are you among those who are critical?

I hope we can have order, Mr. Chairman.

Are you critical of the CIA?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I do not discuss intelligence matters in open session. If you would like to talk to me about that privately, I would be glad to do so. But I will not talk about intelligence matters in an open session.

The CHAIRMAN. We are having a briefing this afternoon from the CIA, too.

Senator HELMS. I think that the Secretary, what goes on here, he can at least say no, I think the CIA did a pretty good job, or yes, I have been criticizing it. But, you know, why hide behind this classified stuff when the CIA has made public all of this stuff and verified it, as far as I'm concerned?

Is it fair to assume that you have received a CIA briefing about human rights abuses during Aristide's rule?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I am not going to talk about intelligence briefings that I may have received. I have indicated to you that I would be glad to discuss that with you in private.

Senator, I have lived quite a while, and a few people have sometimes misunderstood my courtesy for a lack of resolve. I think they have been sorry when they have made that mistake. I want you to know that I do not intend to discuss these intelligence matters in a public session.

Senator HELMS. That's your choice.

My time is up.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

I turn now to the Senator from Maryland, Mr. Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. First of all, let me say, Mr. Chairman, I think the Secretary is absolutely right in the position he has taken not to discuss intelligence matters in open session. I think anyone who stops and reflects on that, even for the briefest of moments would reach the same conclusion. We cannot take matters which are, by their nature, classified, and then, for purposes of, in effect, haranguing the Secretary, drag them out into the public view.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I am interested in—

Senator HELMS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike and I take offense at that, particularly from Senator Sarbanes, who has beleaguered witness after witness when the previous administration sent people up here.

You can have your opinion as to whether I'm abusing him or not. But he's entitled to—

Senator SARBANES. I didn't say "abused." I said "harangued."

Senator HELMS. Harangued. What's the difference?

Senator SARBANES. But "abused" may be an accurate description of it as well. [General laughter.]

I am not going to quarrel over that.

Senator HELMS. Well, quarrel if you wish. It suits me fine.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I was struck by the comment right on the first page of your statement, in which you talk about the need to accomplish this transformation at a time when the definitions, certainties, and ground rules of the cold war have disappeared.

It is my perception that one of the problems we have encountered in redefining U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold war period is that for 45 years we have had an overriding, guiding principle. Everything was defined in terms of the superpower conflict: containing communism, restraining it, and, hopefully, in the end, undermining it, as in fact happened. Everything could be related to that objective.

We had a nicely defined framework in which to perceive every issue. Now, with the implosion of the Soviet Union, as you point out, we are building on the historically unique situation that the major powers can be partners cooperating for peace, not competitors locked in conflict.

I think, sometimes, as we face the problems of the moment, we forget the importance of that fundamental change and the necessity of sustaining it.

Now, one of the problems, as I perceive it, at least, is that we now have competing objectives. There are a number of principles and objectives we are seeking to achieve and, sometimes, they do not all work in the same direction. Therefore, we have to balance them in each particular situation.

I take it that, in the administration's view, sustaining the direction in which the former Soviet Union is moving—in other words, toward democracy and markets—and ending to the cold war stand-off by encouraging Russia to be a positive force in international dealings, rather than a negative force, is perhaps the single-most important objective on our agenda. How do you perceive that?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I agree with you that we are in a period where there is no single lodestone, such as a bipolar conflict, that would enlighten all of our decisions. We are in a more difficult period of trying to find our way to a new set of principles.

That is why, Senator, I outlined six priorities that I try to follow when I come to work every day. One of those certainly is trying to improve the prospects for democracy and free markets in Russia.

I think this is an overarching requirement for our administration and one we are working on constantly.

It is a unique situation, as you indicated, Senator, where all the major powers of the world are in a situation where we are working together and we are at peace and, in most instances, in harmony.

Now great powers, obviously, have differences, as we have differences from time to time with Russia. But we are working them out in an atmosphere of cooperation and harmony. We know we have people to talk to without having an ideological battle underlying or transforming the conversation.

So you are absolutely right, Senator. That is a very high priority for this administration.

I have not sought to try to rank the six priorities that I mentioned in any rank order. I would have to say that I think a unique

part of President Clinton's insight is that economic issues are crucial to American foreign policy. We put economic issues right at the top of American foreign policy.

So I would rank that along with improving the relations with Russia as a very high priority.

Senator SARBANES. Now the other area where I think there has been a fundamental transformation, potentially of enormous consequence, is in the Middle East.

What I am concerned about is a tendency to focus on situations like Haiti and Somalia which are very difficult, very complex, and hard of solution. And we lose sight of the fact that, within a broader context, some very basic and significant things are transpiring in a very positive and constructive direction.

The implosion of the Soviet Union is one, with all its implications. Another, which may have in part flowed from that, is the fundamental changes that are taking place in the Middle East and the prospects for moving to a comprehensive peace settlement in that area.

To what extent do you think that the implosion of the Soviet Union was an important factor in the moving toward peace in the Middle East?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I think it was a very important factor, Senator. It changes the context of all the discussion. Some of the countries in the Middle East no longer have a patron that they can count on. Some of the countries there which previously looked to Russia now look to the United States. I think that, as I say, changes the context, changes our leverage and our capacity for influence.

All over the world I think the end of the cold war, the end of the bipolar conflict and confrontation, has made important changes in the way problems are viewed.

Senator SARBANES. In that regard, let me say I very much welcome the statement in your submission about ending the Arab boycott of Israel. It is an abominable anachronism and it needs to be brought to an end. I know the administration is working very hard in that regard.

I want to ask you this question. Does your nonproliferation effort extend to conventional weaponry?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, it is focused on weapons of mass destruction. But I think we are also conscious of overloading areas with very high-tech conventional weapons, burdening economies of developing countries. So we do whatever we can to avoid rivalries of that kind, especially in areas where there is lots of tension.

Our nonproliferation policy, though, does focus on weapons of mass destruction, not only nuclear but biological and chemical as well.

Senator SARBANES. Well, of course, some of these conventional weapons are very destructive. I guess essentially I am probing to find out whether it is your view that the general level of arms ought to be brought down. I mean, we are bringing them down in this country. Why shouldn't they be brought down everywhere, worldwide, nuclear and conventional?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I think they ought to be, Senator, and I think we are pursuing that. That is a difficult thing to do because

a number of countries have a great stake in their arms manufacturers. But we will keep on working with our allies in the U.N. on that project as well.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Christopher, I appreciated your organization of priorities and I think the priorities that you have described are correct. I would just underline the first priority, economic security. You have stated accurately that the next 40 days are crucial for this country and our economic security, with the NAFTA Treaty, the Uruguay Round of GATT, and the APEC Conference.

I would just say that I hope all members of this committee would work with you and the President in every way for success in each of these three ventures. This is because of the downside of failure, or, as you have described it, the snowball effect of NAFTA failing, affecting GATT, as well as the prestige of the President, as he goes to APEC following the NAFTA vote in the House. People have to realize the gravity of the situation for our country.

We are not going to have a whole lot of domestic prosperity next year if all the jobs are lost in November and December of this year. I think your priority is right on.

I am more disturbed, however, by what occurred, at least in the paper today, in the accounts of the Russian military doctrine. I do not have any inside information, and I respect your judgment as to how to interpret this.

But as I read Fred Hyatt's account in the "Washington Post" this morning, he said: "Grachev was in an expansive mood as he described the new policy for Russian and foreign journalists. He spoke out against NATO accepting any new members and said he favors keeping Russian troops in Latvia and Estonia until those Baltic States guarantee the rights of their Russian-speaking minorities."

Then, as you point out, the doctrine rejects the long-time Soviet promise not to use nuclear weapons first, and Grachev said the doctrine, likewise, rejects stated Soviet policy that aggression should be repulsed only to the point of reestablishing existing borders. Instead, the new doctrine approves of Russian troops repelling aggression and going on the offensive, even beyond the borders, and Grachev denied that the Russians had had anything to do with the Abkhazia separatist movement.

Now, maybe so. But I would simply say that I think common sense would read this with some apprehension. In other words, as you have pointed out, we have devoted a good part of this year and a good part of the final year of the last administration in trying to establish ways in which we can be helpful to President Yeltsin, Mr. Kozyrev, and other Russian leaders. Frankly, all of this comes as a surprise to people who are friendly with them. In other words, there is this new assertion at this particular time, as we are coming up to the NATO summit January 10 and as we have all weighed in heavily with regard to the Baltic States. Now we begin to see the development of the so-called Russia abroad policy, in which there appears to be much more assertiveness by Russia with

the formerly, and hopefully still newly independent states, with great pressure being placed upon these states. This is even so with Ukraine, with denial of fuel resources and clearly an attempt, apparently even by people who are democratic to try to incorporate more of the independent states into their orbit.

Why, at least, is your initial impression of all of this sanguine or hopeful? It seems to me this is a bad day and we should call time out and ask what is going on here among our friends. Why are they making these assertions and why are we surprised about it, because, frankly, I am. Maybe you are not. You were over there just a while ago. But this seems to me to be not very good news.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, first let me say that it is worth remembering that Grachev is Secretary of Defense in a country where there is a dispirited army, dispirited defense forces that are being dramatically reduced.

He, obviously, has a morale situation on his hands. I think his oral comments, different from the doctrine itself, need to be read in that context.

With respect to NATO, I can tell you that I heard it directly from President Yeltsin that they are very positive about the partnership for peace concept that we have put forward, which contemplates an expansion of NATO in an evolutionary manner. That is the way they think it ought to be done. They do not want to be excluded from the possibility of joining the West.

There is a very strong tendency in Russia to want to be part of the West.

So I would put a lot more weight on what President Yeltsin said on that.

With respect to the Baltics, once again, I think it is a good sign in the statement of doctrine itself that they intend to withdraw all Russian forces back to Russia from all of the new independent states. Grachev himself has had a view that Russian forces should not be withdrawn from Latvia and Estonia until there is provision made for the Russian minorities in those two countries to vote.

That is not the view of the Russian Government, and there are discussions going forward at the highest level between President Yeltsin and the Presidents of Latvia and Estonia. So forces have been drawn down in the Baltics and I think the statement is consistent with the fact, the doctrine is consistent with the fact that those forces will be out of Latvia and Estonia in the relatively near future.

So, Senator, I am going to study that statement some more. I know you will. I look forward to talking with you about it again. But I do not read it with the apprehension that, apparently, you do this morning.

The story was perhaps cast in those terms. But I have had reports from our experts and from our Embassy, and they, think, regard it as a statement of doctrine not unlike our process here, trying to adapt the Russian military to the new, post-cold war era.

I look forward to talking with you further about that, Senator. Senator LUGAR. Very good.

It just appears to me, getting on to the third priority and NATO, that the partnership for peace is an important step forward. I con-

gratulate you on that and on working with others who are endorsing it.

I suppose I would still raise the question in the context of the last statement, however. I can understand why President Yeltsin would make appropriately complimentary statements about it, as did Mr. Kozyrev. But I fear, in a way, that we are paying too much attention to the Russian view of Western security, of our own security.

In other words, I would prefer that we were approaching this from the standpoint of what was in our best interest in incorporating other countries into NATO in a much more rapid or certain fashion.

You pointed out today, correctly, that partnership for peace does not have an agenda of countries or timetables or roadmaps. It offers military exercises that may bring others together with us and offers some possibility for incorporation of them, including Russia and Ukraine. But, at the same time, it could also be interpreted by Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and others as a very great disappointment because they may see it as a deferral of their hopes for much greater certainty at a time the window is opening.

Looking at it from their standpoint, as they read the new military doctrine of Russia, they might say the Russians, despite protestations, are determined to bring back for Russia the boundaries that the Soviet Union had.

It appears to me that we have to take this more seriously, given this new Russian military doctrine. Anyone taking a look at what has occurred in Georgia, despite the protestations, would have to say there is strong evidence that Russia helped destabilize Georgia and now Russia is rescuing Georgia. And the independence that Georgia might have expressed is certainly very much less right now. The pressure being put on Ukraine is very considerable, and the concessions apparently made by President Kravchuk earlier on, when he talked about returning the missiles and dividing up the Navy, came from that economic pressure.

Now how do you square what appear to be signs of considerable pressures on these newly independent states with a more salutary feeling that NATO membership can wait or that there is not emerging a boundary of Russia very close to where we were before?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, first let me go back to one of the things you earlier said.

My obligation is to protect the interests of the American people. I have taken an oath to do that. So when I make my decisions, it is in those terms.

I do not want any misunderstanding about that. I am not concerned about Russian reactions or attitudes except as they affect American interests.

Our judgment, my judgment is that the partnership for peace is the best approach to protecting American interests and the expansion of NATO.

Naturally I am concerned about the possibility of the expansion of Russia. But I think President Yeltsin is the best ally we have among the choices in Russia today to keep that in bounds. I think he respects the territorial integrity of the other newly independent states.

Those who tried to overthrow him on October 3 and 4 had just the opposite impression. They wanted to recreate the Russian empire. Khasbulatov is supposed to have a map in his office which has the old Russian empire on it, the old Soviet empire on it. He is said to say, "I keep it there because it might come in handy another time."

That is not the Yeltsin attitude.

Clearly, Russia is concerned about conflicts on its borders, as I think we might be. It is our job, I think the American job, to remind them that they should only take those actions in surrounding countries in accordance with international norms, in accordance with the U.N., in accordance with the CSCE.

So it is not that I am concerned about it, Senator. It is just my judgment and the judgment of the President that it is in the best interests of the American people to avoid a reversion in Russia to the bad old days of the Communists and their world expansion.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Dodd.

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, let me welcome you here this morning.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator DODD. Let me just add as well, in addition to your own availability, which the chairman has outlined, I would like the record to reflect as well that I have found the Secretary's staff and the Department have been extremely responsive in a number of areas that we have inquired about. I think it is certainly not in anyone's interest to spend a great deal of time dwelling on that point, except to say that I have certainly been satisfied.

Let me just join my colleague from Indiana in commending you for your priorities as you have laid them out here. I think it is exactly the right order.

I want to underscore what my colleague has said about NAFTA. I think it is critically important. There is nothing more important to this hemisphere than that issue right now. I could not agree more.

I think it is on the 18th that the President is due, the day after the NAFTA vote in the House. I know the administration is doing everything possible. Many of us are here as well. But I commend you for listing that and the economic security issues.

Let me just say briefly, as well, that I think it is important to place into context what are the large, large issues and what are important issues, but not quite as important as others. I think, on the large issues, the large issues, the administration is doing a good job, in my view—certainly on the economic questions. It is a difficult battle up here on some of these issues. But I think you are doing a very good job on the Middle East. I think the President got high marks, and deservedly so, for the summit with Japan. Certainly the President's leadership during the crucial hours, when the fledgling efforts with Russia were at stake, I think made a significant difference there. In South Africa and on nonproliferation, on these major questions I think you are doing a good job.

These are difficult days, obviously, in the wake and collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war. These are new waters that we are sailing in. I think people ought to step back a little

bit and take a look at the larger questions in terms of where this administration is. I think any objective analysis of that would conclude that we are doing a pretty good job.

Now we have some other problems which are not insignificant. But I do not think they deserve to be kind of on the same level, if you will, as the ones I have just mentioned. It has not been an all-inclusive list.

Certainly the problems in Bosnia, in Somalia, and in Haiti are important, and they are ones that are not new to this administration. They have been around for a while. You have a lot of different pieces of advice from Members of Congress as to what we ought to do. But no one that I know of has cornered the market on exactly how we ought to deal with those issues.

So I just generally want to commend you.

Now let me focus, if I can, a bit on Haiti. Obviously I have a particular interest in this hemisphere as I chair the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

I just want to underscore that members up here can have disagreements. I have spent over 5 hours now in private briefings, closed briefings, with the intelligence community and others, trying to learn as much as I could about these issues. I think I have probably spent more time than any other single member of this committee meeting with President Aristide to talk with him and trying to discern where we are.

Let me just tell you my conclusions, and each one of us can have different ones.

I think President Aristide is a good man. Whether or not he is defrocked and so forth is irrelevant, in my view. He was elected by almost 70 percent of the people of his country.

I know that country. I served in the Peace Corps on the border of that country 25 years ago. It has never known a moment's worth of peace since its independence in 1804. It has never had a free election. There has never been an election in recent time in Latin America where, by everyone's calculation, it was free, that a person has been elected with the majority that President Aristide was.

I have listened to all the information that has been raised against him as a person. I find on most counts that it is not credible, and on some that have been raised here this morning it is highly speculative, and there is significant disagreement as to the allegations.

But I do not think we ought to lose sight of things here. This is not a debate about a person, necessarily. That may be important. But what is important here is this little country has struggled to achieve democracy. It did so. Their freely elected President was ousted by a group of thugs.

Now you can go so far as to say here that a lot of the information we are getting is from the very same people who in front of the world are brutally murdering people. They are dragging them out of churches, murdering a justice minister in front of the entire globe. And we are relying on a lot of those very same people for the information we are getting, I will tell my colleagues and others here.

So I think President Aristide is a good person and a good man. But, that aside, I think it is in our interest to support democracy.

We have more democracies today in this hemisphere than at any point since the arrival of the European culture on this continent. My colleague from Indiana has made that point on numerous occasions in the past.

It is a great opportunity and it ought not to be treated lightly. No one wants to see the life of an American lost anywhere on the globe. But in protecting and defending democracy, that is clearly in our interest. If we do not stand up for Haiti, if we are not willing to stand up for these people, who will? If not in our own hemisphere, who will?

So, Mr. Secretary, I want to tell you that I think you are on the right track. Others of my colleagues here may disagree. But I think you are basically following the right course. It is not an easy one. But when members up here offer comfort, in my view, to the thugs who have denied the return of President Aristide and the restoration of democracy by their statements, it is going to be that much more difficult.

So I want some of those people listening here this morning to know that at least one Senator here is not going to tolerate anything short of allowing democracy to blossom in that country and to give that President a chance to return to his nation.

Now it may take 1 month, 6 months, 1 year or 2 years. But I will never accept anything short of that and I think it is in our interest to do so. So I commend you for the position you have taken.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator DODD. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Kassebaum.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, to follow Senator Dodd's I think very impassioned and eloquent appeal, let me just use that as an example because I think, certainly, Mr. Secretary, as you say, there is no single lodestone. The old certainties are not there to frame foreign policy today. This makes it even that much more difficult, obviously.

So you have to have the flexibility that is necessary, given each particular situation. But also I would argue that, once policy is enunciated, be certain you will stand by that policy.

I think nothing can be more unsettling than to hear policy enunciated by the President and then to begin to have to reverse course. That I think creates a great deal of uncertainty.

It is much easier, of course, in hindsight to say what should be done, and I realize that.

I have enormous respect for your integrity and your skills as a negotiator. That is not what is being challenged. It is just how we deal with, for instance, Haiti.

I agree with much of what Senator Dodd has said. On the other hand, reflecting on history and the U.S. relationship with Haiti, it would seem to me that caution should have been used as far as making a commitment for the United States to be a participant with force because we have been a lightning rod in Haiti for a long time.

I do not want to get sidetracked from my questions, but I think it is an example; and I think there are some others, Mr. Secretary. Somalia is one, as well.

There were many of us, both here and I am sure in the administration, who felt a deadline for our leaving Somalia was a mistake. Nevertheless, there were many here calling for it, obviously, as well as when the President announced it.

We have a limited amount of time to use what weakened leverage we have. I was pleased to see by this morning's paper that we are going to now allow our troops to be engaged in keeping key roads and lines of communication open, which the President and you have stated was important to do. I would certainly second that.

I can think of no further compounding of the tragedy that has occurred there for our forces than to have them withdraw at the end of March and really see what started out to be a very successful, noble mission, end in chaos again. It seems to me we have to use this time wisely between now and the end of March in being engaged in a constructive and positive way.

My question is I assume we are going to continue to be visible there, Mr. Secretary, and use this opportunity. Are we, with a deadline on negotiation for UNOSOM II at the U.N., going to be clear in what, indeed, we intend to do?

When Ambassador Albright was here, she said that the United States has advocated that the resolution extending UNOSOM II take into account new realities and has encouraged the U.N. to focus its attention on a specific number of realistically attainable objectives. Can you add any clarity to perhaps what we might hope to accomplish between now and the end of March?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I think the President chose the end of March as a time that would provide a realistic opportunity for two things to happen. First is for the political process to evolve in a way that gives the various interests in Somalia an opportunity to provide a political settlement, a way to provide some governing structure for their country. We are working at that with the Presidents of the adjacent countries, particularly Ethiopia and Eritrea.

There is going to be a humanitarian conference later this month where those issues I think can come to the fore, that is, such as what kind of political resolution can there be in Haiti.

As you know, Ambassador Oakley is in Somalia today, and I think he is pushing forward on a political resolution. He will be back here in a couple of days and I know he will be meeting with members of this committee again.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I realize that, Mr. Secretary.

I think there are a number of Somalians who feel that, in a way because of General Aideed's action and the outcome of that, that they are being left out now. It seems to me absolutely crucial that all other factions are really given the focus of attention and somehow be a part of a process of getting together around one table, and I think within Somalia.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I agree with that completely.

We need to bring in not Aideed himself, probably, but his clan. We must also make sure that the other competing factions there are involved. One of the great qualities that Ambassador Oakley has, in my judgment, is he has good relationships with all the various clans. It would be his strong determination to bring them all into the discussion.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I agree. I think that it needs to stem from Somalia as much as anything and with the leverage that we have now. It just cannot rest with Ambassador Oakley himself. I mean, there are many players there, and you well know the importance of a firmness of purpose in those negotiations.

Just to continue on a bit about analyzing the situation in Russia, does it trouble you that, evidently, President Yeltsin has retreated from his pledge for a June election?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I think that story is considerably overstated, Senator.

What President Yeltsin said is that he is going to propose a Constitution that will enable the Parliament to determine the time of the next election. The Constitution provides that he is eligible to continue his term as a whole. But with his instinct for democracy, which would seem to come into play in a number of instances, he has said that if Parliament establishes the election next June, that will be fully acceptable to him. So I do not see any retreat from his basic statement that a June election is satisfactory.

What I do think we ought to concentrate on, Senator, is the importance of the election and referendum this December, in which the Parliament will be chosen and the Constitution will be acted upon. But this would give room for the Parliament to establish the election at the time that he had previously said would be satisfactory to him.

I do not see that as a retreat from his prior commitment that a June election would be satisfactory to him. But it will be up to the Parliament and the Constitution, as it ought to be.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, it is, again, a situation which is going to require, obviously, some flexibility. But it seems to me that we have to reiterate, and continually reiterate, what we believe is important and what we will stand by, no matter what may evolve.

I think that is a message that others want to hear. It is a focus that is important. And, as we get scattered around the world with all of these trouble spots, I want to touch on another one, North Korea.

I know that the Secretary of Defense is now there, in the region, consulting. It may not be anything you want to speak to in an open hearing. But it is an extremely, I think, important area for all of us, and there is a great deal of concern that I think I have, which I am sure others would share, with what North Korea's attitude is regarding the IAEA inspections and what our response will be. Certainly, that is a juggling act, Mr. Secretary. But I think no one should be under any misimpression about what positions will be, whatever they may be.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator KASSEBAUM. You just briefly touched on that in your opening statement.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Let me first comment on your comments about Russia.

In every conversation that I have I remind them that our support for them is based on the understanding that they are pursuing democratic values. They are very reassuring on this score, both the President and Foreign Minister Kozyrev, with whom I deal on a very regular basis. But our support is based upon our understand-

ing that they are pursuing democratic means, and they seem to be at every turn.

With respect to North Korea, without extending my remarks at all, I agree with you about the acute sensitivity of the matter. The head of the IAEA has not yet found that there is a break in the continuity of inspections. If that were to be found, we would have to go back to the U.N. and seek sanctions there.

I have dealt very closely with both the Foreign Minister of Japan and the Foreign Minister of South Korea. Their concern is very acute about this. I just want to assure you that we are following this issue with a great deal of care and concern. It is not an easy one to handle.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I have some other questions, Mr. Chairman, of the Secretary but I will wait for the next round.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Kerry.

Senator KERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator KERRY. Mr. Secretary, I want to join in welcoming you here this morning.

I was just reading your statement, which you did not read in full before the committee. I want to congratulate you on it. I think that there is a particularly important statement you make in it that we all need to keep in mind as we think about where we are going, and that is the statement on page 2, where you say, "As I travel the world, I see that virtually every nation wants to define its foreign policy in terms relative to the United States, whether in seeking security assurances or expanding trade and investment."

I think that it is very important for us, as we measure Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia, but more importantly the Asia-Pacific issue, which I am glad to see you have laid out as one of the most important of the areas, and the Middle East and so forth, that that reality must be incorporated into our thinking as we contemplate our approaches to these issues.

Before I ask you some questions regarding those, I just want to make one comment on the issue that Senator Kassebaum and Senator Dodd have talked about.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee as well as of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have spent a significant amount of time meeting with the briefers and others regarding this issue related to Haiti, as has Senator Dodd.

I have probably gotten more briefings about it than I think any other Member of Congress, specifically on what has been floating around lately.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senator would yield, we will have a briefing in the Foreign Relations Committee at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Senator KERRY. Yes, there is another briefing coming up this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I realize that.

But what I want to say is, No. 1, it is very clear to me that a very concerted and dangerous effort has been engaged in by some people within the framework of the CIA. I want to be very careful here. I do not brand the entire CIA nor am I saying that this is a broad CIA effort. But there is no doubt that individuals within that agency are engaging in a separate foreign policy and that they

have sought purposefully, beyond any doubt whatsoever in my mind, to place certain information in certain hands in an effort to run a course counter to the policy of this country.

That is a very perfidious, dangerous undertaking. It is not their responsibility to engage in their own foreign policy.

Now I have read in the newspaper reports about their involvement. I do not know whether they are true or not. If they were to be true, then, clearly, there are credibility issues about their current involvement that are very significant, and each Member ought to undertake to ascertain that truth before coming to conclusions.

Finally, it is not our job, as Senators, to form, I think, individual opinions that run counter to elections of other countries. It is certainly our job to make judgments about what lengths we might be willing to go to in terms of the use of American military force with respect to leaders or countries. That is fair game.

But what is not fair game is any effort to alter the election, fair, open, and free, of another nation.

So I join in the message of Senator Dodd without any judgments whatsoever. There are legitimate questions in my mind as to some things. But without any judgment, it is clear that democracy is the goal in Haiti, and this Nation must be clear about our commitment to that goal. This Nation must be clear about our unwillingness to tolerate thugs who murder people in open, visible, measurable ways. We cannot tolerate those kinds of thugs being left to thwart democracy, regardless of personalities.

This Nation had better be resolute and clear about our unwillingness to accept that.

So I think we need to refocus this debate.

While I might have some reservations about what options are available to us down the road, I have no reservations about what our goal ought to be with respect to Haiti.

Now, Mr. Secretary, turning to issues of importance that we face here, one of the questions that comes before us now regarding the use of force in various parts of the world is the relationship we now have to the U.N., which becomes far more important in this entire process. I suppose the exercise we went through on Somalia in a sense is a good one, reminding us of the need to be a little more clear about how we are going to bring Congress and the President together in creating the consensus necessary to back up our choices.

Might you more clearly define for us today whether or not, before an Ambassador votes at the U.N. to commit us to a particular project that may involve American forces in peacekeeping, peace-making, or nation-building, the Congress should first be part of that decision? Or is there some other method by which you feel we can maintain the independence and integrity of the President to conduct foreign policy but the Congress to build the bipartisan consensus necessary to follow through with that policy?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I think we are in a period here where we are learning from the experiences we have had. Unquestionably, there needs to be the widest and most comprehensive kind of consultation with the Congress. I think the new procedures that are being proposed, where we brief Congress on a periodic basis, that is, the highest officials of the government brief key lead-

ers of Congress on a periodic basis so that the Congress is aware of what is going on, I think that ought to contemplate letting the Congress know when we are considering voting for a U.N. resolution that might involve the implications of U.S. forces.

Senator, one of the lessons that we have learned out of this period, certainly that I take away, is that the involvement of U.S. military men and women is a very serious step. It requires the deepest thought on the part of the administration and consultation with the Congress, because you have an important stake in it.

Exactly what the modalities are for that consultation I think we are working through at this period. But, unquestionably, one of the things we learn from Somalia and the other events of recent days and months is that the use of U.S. troops in a combat role is one where it must not be taken lightly. It is one that has the greatest gravity because the American people will insist on it, and they ought to.

Senator KERRY. Well, I think it ought to be pointed out that you and the Clinton administration have not yet placed troops or asked us to place them in any place. This is a hang-over of a Bush placement of troops and policy.

You have already said that you are going to come to us before you go to Bosnia. So I take it, precedentially, you believe that we ought to vote before we commit troops in these situations. Is that accurate?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Yes. It is very hard to make a rule for all seasons. With respect to Bosnia, let me just say that I think the realities are that troops will not be committed there without a vote of this body.

It is hard for me to imagine the commitment of a substantial number of American troops in a comparable situation without a vote of this body.

Senator KERRY. And if I could ask you just quickly on another subject, because the time goes awfully fast, about China. There are many people who have questions about our policy in China now. China has exploded nuclear weapons. Secretary Shattuck has come back. The human rights issue remains of concern. We do not seem to have gained a great deal in the last 12 years, really, in many regards.

Yet we have had an Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Freeman, who has now met with the Chinese. Reports seem to indicate a shift in policy here.

I wonder if you could clarify for us whether there is now a new hope, a new opening, a sense that this is a new policy, or maybe it is not a new policy at all. I would like to ask you just to clarify the administration's approach on China.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, we want to have a comprehensive relationship with China so that we can meet with them in various aspects of our mutual interests, all the way across the board. We think that offers the best hope to have a solid relationship with them in the future.

A very important time is coming ahead with respect to China.

As you know, President Clinton will be meeting with President Jiang Zemin of China in Seattle, around the edges of the APEC meeting. That is one of the good things about President Clinton's

decision to invite the leaders of the various APEC countries to come to Seattle. It gives him an opportunity. This will be the first time our President has met at the highest levels with China.

I will be meeting with the Foreign Minister there, and we will be reminding them that this is a year of very important decision for them.

As I said in my statement, I do not believe we can sustain another year of MFN without some substantial improvement.

So, Senator, there is no dramatic change in policy, but just a desire on our part to have a comprehensive relationship with them that will touch all the areas of our mutual interest. China is a vast country, growing rapidly, with an economy that is improving in the most dramatic fashion.

I think that one of the principal challenges of our foreign policy, as I indicated in the listing of my priorities, is to try to develop a sound relationship with China.

Senator KERRY. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

Senator KERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to be sure. Can people in the back of the room hear adequately? [Pause.]

Good. Senator Pressler.

Senator PRESSLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator PRESSLER. I have been listening with great interest to the exchange between you and Senator Helms. There is a dilemma here because in working on foreign policy with the State Department there is always this business of things being classified. Some things should be classified. But, as a Senator trying to be a part of it, there is this dilemma in that the administration, be it Republican or Democratic, tends to classify a lot of things.

Many years ago, when I was a young, government lawyer, I was on a team. We were working on getting less things classified. It was one of the great reforms of 1970.

But about every 2 or 3 years the classification goes up again. Now I can see the need for some of it, but then it puts us in a box because, in asking questions here, we do have a democracy, and it is necessary that we have an open forum and open discussion.

If we have heard something in a briefing, but it is also publicly known, we really are not supposed to ask about it. I find the same dilemma when I travel to foreign countries. If I go into the Embassy and take the briefing in a classified room, they tell me many things that I already know. But they have told me, then, that they are classified, and I have the dilemma then of not being able to ask the foreign government about them. So I have almost reached the point of not taking briefings sometimes.

I am saying this in a very sincere matter.

Now in the case of Aristide, there have been a lot of things that have gotten into the public domain. Maybe they got there improperly. I don't know how they got there. But these are things like the murder, and his reaction, his management of crises and the way he has reacted, and so on and so forth. We are told there is no disagreement about these things in the intelligence community. Yet,

in a public forum such as this, where we have the Secretary of State—and I am glad that you are here—and people in our country want to participate in democracy, they want to know the facts, we are told that we will discuss that in a closed meeting.

Is that a dilemma in the formulation of foreign policy? How do we resolve that in this case, and particularly in the Aristide case?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I agree with you that there is overclassification, frequently, of information. I try to struggle against it in the State Department, urging people to make as much known to the public as they possibly can.

I did not classify myself the document with respect to President Aristide. That was done by another agency, the agency that we rely on I suppose most for keeping our secrets, or having them. It is hard for me to imagine something that would be more highly classified than that document.

So I would say that in the generality I agree with you, but in this specific case I simply will decline to discuss that in open session. I emphasize that over and over again.

Senator PRESSLER. But I would carry this a step further. I know that maybe being constituent-oriented sounds parochial on this committee. But we go home and explain to our constituents what we are doing on foreign policy and sometimes something is known to them that we cannot discuss.

The point that I am making is that I think things are overclassified—in my judgment. The administration does put out things. President Clinton, after his jog one morning, said the CIA briefing said this and this favorable about such and such. So he at least released part of the CIA briefing.

The point is I think we have overclassified this Aristide thing. A lot of us in good faith are trying to work closely with you and are put in a box.

How do I, as a Senator, trying to follow all the rules, talk to my constituents and explain what I am doing? How do I resolve that in this case when they have information from the airwaves that I am not supposed to be able to respond to their questions on?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I don't know that I can resolve that for you. You might talk to them in this afternoon's briefing. As I say, I did not classify that document. But it is hard for me to imagine anything more sensitive than personality profiles of foreign leaders. That has a high degree of sensitivity.

I doubt that I will ever be prepared to talk about comparable documents in a public forum, and I am not today.

Senator PRESSLER. Also, there were several secret cables regarding the maneuvering on the request for armor in Somalia that many people have asked me about. They write letters to me about it. I am in a dilemma because it is in the papers, and I just think that the administration has to be forthcoming with this in forums such as this.

You have received a CIA briefing on Aristide, is that right?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I said before that I just do not want to get into discussion of intelligence matters. I will meet with you privately. I will do anything you want in a way that does not compromise my obligations with respect to intelligence matters. I have had the full range of information about President Aristide

from top to bottom, and based upon the information I have and my own personal contacts with him, I think he is worthy of our support, based, in a considerable degree, on the fact that he is elected with about 70 percent of the votes in the country of Haiti.

But I just do not want to open the door to a discussion. When you begin with a question, have you received the intelligence briefing, I know where that begins, but I also have a pretty good idea where it leads to, and I do not want to start down that road.

Senator PRESSLER. Let me ask about the chain of command and how it works. Are there principals meeting? Back in the old days there was deputies—that when a foreign policy decision was formulated, there were the deputies meetings, and they would get together from the CIA and the Joint Chiefs, the State Department, Defense Department, and the White House, and then they would make a recommendation to the principals meeting. Do you still operate in such a formalized way?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Generally, Senator, that is right. There is an assistant secretaries group that is below the deputies group. They frequently start the process, and then it goes to the deputies group and then to the principals group. So, in general, your concept is exactly right, Senator.

Senator PRESSLER. Now, I have been told that the principles group did not always include the Joint Chiefs during the Somalia thing, and it did not always include the CIA during the Aristide thing. Is that correct?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Not in my recollection, Senator. My recollection is very strong that in the meetings involving Somalia and the meetings involving Haiti, there was representatives both of the CIA and the Joint Chiefs.

Senator PRESSLER. After the principals meeting, who takes the recommendation to the President, under the current situation?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, the National Security Adviser, if the President himself has not been involved in them. That is his job.

Senator PRESSLER. Can you describe for us on both—on Somalia, it seemed as though the Joint Chiefs, their recommendations did not reach the highest level. And it seems to me, to this Senator, that the CIA's information on Aristide did not reach the principals or the President until very late in the process.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I just dispute your premise. I think the views of both the CIA and the Joint Chiefs were known to all of us as we went through this process, including the President.

Senator PRESSLER. Well, I am asking these things as a friendly Senator who is trying to be a part of this, and I am just hitting a stone wall all the time. But we do have to explain to our people what is going on and how the process works.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, this is not a stone wall. I tell you that my recollection is that they both participated in the meetings and that the President heard their views.

Senator PRESSLER. Now, in a recent interview with the Post the President claimed to have been unaware of the change in the Somalia mission Operation Restore Hope to UNOSOM II. To whom does the responsibility fall to keep the President of the United

States informed of situations in which U.S. troops, under the auspices of the U.N., are involved in combat missions?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, all of us, I think, who are high officials in the Government. The National Security Adviser, the Secretary of Defense, and I as Secretary of State, we all have an obligation to keep the President informed.

Senator PRESSLER. I do have an amendment in the State Department authorization bill—I think that Senator Kerry's question referred to it in a sense—that would require notification—congressional notification before the Security Council. Well, first of all, are you in support of that? I think we are going to be considering that. Here it is a strange thing, we are passing the authorization bill after the appropriations bill, but we do very strange things in the U.S. Senate.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, could you describe your amendment a little further? I did not quite grasp it from the way you put it.

Senator PRESSLER. It would require congressional notification before our delegation makes a commitment at the U.N. in the Security Council, essentially.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, I think one of the roles that we ought to have—our Ambassador there, as well as the State Department, ought to keep you fully informed as to what is going on before we take any major commitment at the U.N.

Senator PRESSLER. Well, I just wanted to ask and get in one more quick question. The United States voted for the resolution that authorized the Somalia step. Did we contribute to the drafting of the resolution? Who in the administration was responsible, if the President was not? Did the NSC adviser approve it without consulting the President?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, which resolution are you speaking of?

Senator PRESSLER. That was the resolution on Somalia.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, there were a number of resolutions about Somalia.

Senator PRESSLER. UNOSOM II.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I do not know the details of that, but I would be sure that the National Security Adviser was informed and he keeps the President very fully informed.

Senator PRESSLER. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Simon.

Senator SIMON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator SIMON. Good morning. We welcome you here. And let me agree with my colleague, Senator Dodd, that on the large issues it seems to me the administration has been doing well. And we have confidence in your ability and your competence, Mr. Secretary.

I would also like to underscore, though, by the nature of things, when we have questions you hear not the areas we agree with, but the areas where we have concerns. I would like to underscore the NAFTA measure also. It is clearly in our economic best interests to have a thriving Mexico next door, but I would also add I think it is in our security interests, talking about defense security. Mexico today has 90 million people. Mexico will eventually have some-

where around 200 million people. There are defense concerns here also, and if NAFTA is rejected I think it is—we are building in the wrong direction.

If I may comment briefly on Somalia. Senator Kassebaum commented, and I agree with her, I think the March 31 date is unfortunate. But I recognize the administration was pushed into that by Congress. I do not fault the administration on that, though I think it is—I think the danger is that any mischief-makers will say we are going to keep quiet until March 31 and then we can do what we want to.

I would ask that the administration consider having Ambassador Oakley there on a more permanent basis. I think that March 31 is going to roll around very, very quickly. And I have great confidence in his skills, and I think that is one where there should be consideration of that.

In your prepared remarks where you mention your priorities, Africa, with the exception of Somalia, does not get onto that priority list. And I know you cannot go into every area, but Africa, alone among the continents, is experiencing a declining standard of living. And when I combine that with the proposed legislation of the Department, that the Development Fund for Africa would not have any earmarked funds. And you may have been out of the country when the Washington Post had an editorial questioning the wisdom of that.

I am concerned about whether Africa is getting the kind of priority it should receive in the State Department, you may want to comment on that.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I want to stress the importance that I attach to Africa. I went out to the African-American Institute recently and made an entire address devoted to Africa.

Senator SIMON. And you were the first Secretary of State to do that, I might add, and I appreciate that.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thanks. It reflects the kind of priority that I give to it. You will find in the longer statement other references to Africa. Indeed, Africa is very much on our mind these days, because it is a source of a number of the regional conflicts that are of great concern: Sudan, Angola, Mozambique, Burundi. That is constantly on our plate and is a matter of concern for us.

So I did allude to it in my statement of priorities on page 4, but I tried to reference it by going back to the major speech I had made on that subject. It is clearly a continent of great concern to us.

Senator SIMON. Let me shift to another area where I have been pushing the State Department for some years with less than overwhelming success, and that is on the language competence matter. The Inspector General's report of July—let me just cite a few things here. It says personnel at one model language post, the Consulate General in Sao Paulo, had no knowledge of the Department's model language program or that their post was included in it.

Second, only 57 percent of language-designated positions in the Foreign Service in 1993 were filled by personnel who had the necessary language qualifications. There were no foreign language qualification standards for the Department's many civil servants who regularly conduct foreign policy.

And then finally, despite clear deficiencies, funding of post-language programs, which aim to remedy our shortfalls here, has fallen from \$1.1 million in 1989, to \$610,000 in 1990, to \$594,000 in 1993. We continue to have the only Foreign Service in the world—you can get into the Foreign Service without the knowledge of a foreign language. And this is an area where I really believe we are hurting ourselves by not having stronger programs.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I agree with much of what you say. I would attach very high priority to that. Only about a month ago, Senator, I spoke at the dedication of the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, which is a marvelous center that was initiated through work by Secretary Schultz many years ago, and it has really come into its full flower now, fortunately here during the time when I am in the State Department.

They teach 63 languages there. They have new facility, new capacity to teach languages. And I talked to the director of the institute or of the center, and I think he realizes the importance of language. We do not do as well as we should, Senator. But I must say, in my travels in the new independent states of the former Soviet Union, I was very impressed with the language competence of our officers in Kazakhstan and in Belarus. We have been able to reach deep into our Foreign Service and bring to all of those newly independent states people with language competence that enables them to work effectively.

I also happened, Senator, to go to one Embassy that was a manifestation of your very good idea of having an Embassy where everybody was language competent in the country. It is a very important idea. I just wish we had more funds to work more effectively with language training.

Senator SIMON. And if I may just add in that connection, the model posts in foreign languages, I got that adopted over the objection of the State Department. But I would be happy to fight with you for more funding for that kind of thing. I think it is absolutely essential that we do it.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I know you did not mean it—it was not over my objection.

Senator SIMON. No, it was not over you. It happened some years prior to your being Secretary of State.

You mentioned Asia. You did not mention one part of the Asian problem that I think is a major concern, or should be a major concern, and that is the one area where the nuclear threat remains a very real possibility. And I think it will not get resolved unless we have Pakistan, India, China, Russia, and the United States working together here. Are we making any headway? Is that moving toward the front burner in terms of a priority within the State Department?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, in preparing the statement today I thought the committee was owed a full statement of what I am doing, what my work is, what I see my job as being, and I tried to lay that out. And I think in longer statement—I did not try to read the long statement here—I refer to south Asia as being one of the areas of real concern about nuclear proliferation.

We have established, with the cooperation of Congress, I believe at the insistence of Congress, a South Asia Bureau. And I have

charged that Bureau and the new Assistant Secretary that the highest priority is trying to do something about the nuclear confrontation or the potential confrontation of India and Pakistan. So, yes, that is an area of very deep concern for us. It is one of the proliferation areas that I think has to be right on the top of the list of concerns.

Senator SIMON. If I may just follow through here. Are we making any headway in pulling the five nations together to talk about this? And if we are not, is there any one nation that particularly is recalcitrant in this?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, let me put that in a positive vein, Senator. There is now a new government in Pakistan, and I hope that that new government will be responsive to the kind of conversations that are necessary in the five nations group. I also hope that China will be willing to participate.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good morning. I wonder if the Secretary would be willing, at a time convenient to the chairman and a time that could be scheduled on his schedule as well, to brief us on aspects surrounding his inability to comment particularly on the Aristide-Haiti issue which he has declined, relative to having received or not received a briefing from the CIA and some of the others, since there is no point going into those questions here as he has declined to comment in an open session.

My question is, would he be willing at some time to address these with us; both sides obviously?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Yes, Senator, I would be very glad to do that at a time convenient to the Chair. I do not know whether you were here, Senator. I did say that I do not lack information on this subject.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I understand. I was here.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. And based upon all of that information, I said what I said.

Senator MURKOWSKI. That would suffice for this Senator, and I would assume that the staff, with the chairman, would proceed in some matter of form on that, unless there is disagreement. I thank the Chair.

I am heartened, Mr. Secretary, by your emphasis on economic policy as being the heart of foreign policy. I am a little concerned, however, with the Pacific Rim. Your emphasis clearly was on APEC, but there were a couple of countries that were left off. Vietnam was not mentioned, and clearly that is a responsibility of the State Department with the President's recent announcement that there is a relaxation.

There is a formula out there somewhere, that the private sector is still waiting to receive, regarding how they can do business in conjunction with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is my understanding that that is held up down at the White House pending a release soon. I would hope that there would be an understandable formula, so that American business can par-

ticipate, and we just do not leave this out in the open for an extended period of time.

I am also concerned about the fact that Taiwan is not mentioned in your statement; not that you could necessarily mention everything. And I am also concerned with the manner in which the administration is pursuing its policy toward China, which may or may not be a new policy.

But to be more specific, Mr. Secretary, I think we are all aware that there is a certain amount of uneasiness among the Asian Pacific countries over the realization that the PRC's advanced technology related to armaments proliferation is continuing to grow. Have we put together an assessment, a threat assessment on the People's Republic of China, and what criteria is the Government using to assess whether China's modernization and power projection constitutes a threat to Taiwan or other Asian nations?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, if I could, just let me go back to a comment you made at the beginning of your remarks. I recall now that various State Department officials have been involved in meetings with members of this committee on President Aristide and the classified information involving him. I think there may be representatives of the State Department at the meeting this afternoon. So I would just say to you, Senator, that if the participation by the other State Department officials does not satisfy you, of course I will be available to you, as I always will be.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I think that would be appropriate.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I would like to say that I hope you will assess whether or not you need me after you hear from other State Department officials on this, but I will be available if you want me.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I think it is fair to say, so far, after hearing from other State Department officials, it is the opinion of this Senator that we do need you.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. With respect to the threat assessment on China, that is certainly something that our intelligence agencies are constantly involved in. It is one of the reasons why we are concerned about proliferation policy, the degree to which they are assembling and assessing and having available weapons of mass destruction. That is, once again, a subject that I do not think you would want me to talk about in this open session, the degree to which they may have perfected various kinds of devices, but I can tell you it is certainly a lively issue in our intelligence community.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, that is reassuring, Mr. Secretary. I recognize time is very limited. I would like to go into these even further, but I obviously cannot.

I am concerned with the interpretation of the State Department with regard to our relations with Taiwan. And as you and I both know, the Taiwan Relations Act is the law of the land, and it states that the United States will make available to Taiwan such defensive articles as they may need for their defense.

We have got a joint communique that came through in 1982 between the United States and China, which is a little different, because the act is between the United States and Taiwan. The communique is a policy statement. It was never ratified by Congress. We have had inconsistencies, of course, in the manner in which we have an understanding with regard to increasing arms sales to Tai-

wan, yet the threat of the PRC potentially is greater as they achieve more offensive capability. My question is whether this administration agrees that the Taiwan Relations Act is the law of the land and takes primacy over the policy statements set forth in the communiques?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I am sorry to keep going back, but I did not want to avoid your question on Vietnam, and that is certainly a subject that is our responsibility, along with the President, and we are pursuing that. You know, the President has given highest priority to making sure that we get all available information on the POW's and the MIA's. We have been moving sequentially, as you indicate, and we are going to continue to study that and hope that we can make progress toward normalization there, but it will depend upon the assessment of the progress on the POW's and the MIA's.

With respect to the Taiwan Relations Act and China, when I was in Government before, Senator, I was involved in working with Congress on the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act. Our China policy is governed by the three communiques of the Taiwan Relations Act. I do not see any reason to determine at this point the precedents of the Taiwan Relations Act. I think that kind of legislation would call into question our China policy in a way that would not be helpful.

We are going to continue to try to provide Taiwan with weapons that enable them to maintain a military capability, but as far as legislation that would try to take a stand in that delicate balance between the three communiques which are the basic constitution of our relations with modern China and the Taiwan Relations Act, I would not be in favor of trying to define that very delicate relationship in legislation that says one takes precedence over the other. I think they can be harmonized.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, I understand, Mr. Secretary. Partially, your business is diplomacy. But Taiwan is our sixth largest trading partner. We have an extraordinary relationship that we have made work, and I think that we are playing smoke and mirrors in the sense the F-16 sale was considered outside the bucket. That was a matter of convenience. U.S. sales to Taiwan are in jeopardy now because they must be cleared through the State Department on an individual basis, while sales from the French continue.

And I would hope that the folks down at the State Department would look favorably at a letter that Chairman Lee Hamilton and myself have sent over to your office with regard to sales of nonlethal weapons. They are nonlethal, and clearly we are going to lose those sales, we are going to lose those jobs to the French or others, and they are for use on third-party platforms.

I would encourage you, Mr. Secretary, on the Vietnam issue, to go as far as you can go now within the authority of the President by simply spelling out the formula so that U.S. businesses cannot do business but within the limitation of our participation in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. And I would encourage, finally, for U.S. business. I come from a banking background. I want to know the mechanics of how U.S. businesses go over there and make a contribution and a profit. And we need to have the State Department focus in more.

And I am very disappointed regarding U.S. policy toward Georgia. We have U.S. firms trying to come into Georgia. They are not receiving the help from the State Department, from the Ambassador over there, and it is very discouraging to U.S. business. And I would respectfully urge you to focus in on the necessity of establishing and assisting U.S. businesses in that regard.

I have several other questions which I would pose in writing. I wish you a good day and commend you on a very difficult job. I think you have made great progress with regard to Japan's market, opening it up for U.S. businesses of late. I think Vice President Mondale deserves a lot of credit. But we have to look out, because as we deal with Japanese trade the devil is in the details, as you know. Thank you.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I will get back to you on all of those three things that you mentioned, as well as your other written questions. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Senator Wofford.

Senator WOFFORD. Mr. Secretary, your good statement this morning, with priorities and perspective and a world vision for American foreign policy, reminds me of Toynbee's conclusion after going through his—doing his 13 volumes on the history of civilization, that the urgent is the enemy of the important. That was his conclusion after looking at the fall of civilizations.

And, indeed, the urgent issues of Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti are before us, and rightly so. And yet you contributed again today, as you did in your major presentations in other forums in the last 9 months, in raising our sights to the important. I do not agree with every one of the policies that you or the President have recommended, but I have confidence in the perspective and the sense of priorities that you have given us today and in the past, especially since after your six major ones you have now, with Senator Simon, confirmed that Africa is a seventh priority.

And, of course, the Western Hemisphere is one, as you have shown by your testimony today. I want to strongly join Senator Dodd, whose leadership on Western Hemisphere affairs on our committee and over the years has been so important. I stand with him on everything he said about our holding fast to the course in Haiti.

In that connection, I would like to ask to what extent we are dealing with tightening the embargo on materials coming from the Dominican Republic?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, we are trying to tighten the embargo with respect to the subjects that it covers—that is, arms and oil. And we realize that porous border there is a risky place, and we have been in touch with the Dominican Republic Government on that subject.

As far as further tightening, I think you know that that is a matter of balance. We want to do what is necessary to leave no doubt in the mind of the military that we are going to pursue this very aggressively. On the other hand, we want to try to avoid more harm, more hurt to the poor people of Haiti than is absolutely necessary. So we will be trying to go forward with more sanctions, targeted sanctions, but taking into account the need to balance.

Senator WOFFORD. I understand the balance. I hope the going forward is done with strength so that as soon as possible the thugs who have displaced the elected regime in Haiti are themselves out. And I want that maximum tightening to occur with all deliberate speed.

On the question of the Arab boycott, you said some movement has been made, and Assistant Secretary Djerejian said substantial progress has been made, yet Saudi Arabia has sent the largest number of letters to American companies in the last period, from July to September, 314. Can you give us any encouragement for so many of us who are impatient with the lack of progress over the years on this, on how soon, as part of this vital peace process in the Middle East, that boycott can be lifted?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, I am impatient too, Senator. We have had a substantial lifting in the sense that the secondary and tertiary boycott has been lifted by a number of countries there in practice, if not in formal statement. We also saw a very interesting development, Senator, just a few days ago when they attempted to hold a meeting of the Arab countries to discuss the boycott. And a number of them declined to attend, I think indicating that they are not prepared to discuss any expansion of the boycott or, indeed, I think indicating hesitation on the part of a number of the countries, especially in the gulf, with respect to the pursuance of the boycott.

I do not know that I can give you a timetable, but I can say that it will be closely attuned to our other progress in the Middle East. One of the arguments that we are making that I think is really hitting home, Senator, and that is the argument that the boycott, at the present time, is likely to hurt the Palestinians because of their joint activities with the Israelis. So the boycott is hurting the very country or the very group of people that it was initially designed to help, that is the Palestinians, and I think that argument is hitting home.

Senator, without wanting to predict with any precision, I guess I would urge you to watch for informal breaking down of the boycott. That is the way the secondary and tertiary boycotts initially broke down themselves. And I would think that the boycott against Israel will begin to break down in that way, and I see some signs of that already happening.

Senator WOFFORD. My last question is related to our Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Relations Subcommittee. You may recall that 19 members of this committee have urged you to transfer \$15 million from the major program to assist in reform in the former Soviet Union to Peace Corps programs in that region. I do not know whether the decision has been made yet, but it seems to me that would be a very constructive thing that would enable also the Peace Corps to respond to the urgent need of Eritrea and Ethiopia, to return to those countries.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I am sorry, I know that proposal and I do not know the exact status of it, but I will get back to you on that.

Senator WOFFORD. And, Mr. Chairman, I also want to join Senator Kerry in his concern that, once again, it appears that parts of the CIA have been embarking on an effort to conduct their own for-

eign policy, as we have seen with such sad results in the past. And in due course, I think we should look into that.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Senator Brown.

Senator BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start off, if I could, simply by addressing you and responding to your letter. As you know, I, with a number of other members of this committee, had asked that the Secretary of Defense come before the committee to review the events that have happened in Somalia. We had followed up with a letter in that regard and had passed on the floor a resolution calling for an investigation of the October 3 military disaster in Somalia.

You were kind enough to reply promptly. You indicated that you did not feel an appearance by the Secretary of Defense before this committee was appropriate. And, Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for you and your integrity. I simply wanted to mention this. As I read the rules on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations it lists, No. 11, interventions abroad and declarations of war, and No. 18, U.N. and its affiliated organizations. Our activities in Somalia were under the guide of in some areas, and in conjunction with the U.N. very direct. Particularly the conduct of military operations were part of a U.N. command.

I, for one, find that a great lack of facts has come out as to what happened in Somalia on October 3. We have not been able to get answers to our letters to the Secretary of Defense. When the Under Secretary of Defense was here in this room, he refused to answer a number of our questions that were put to him directly. He has refused to answer the followup questions that I sent to them.

Mr. Chairman, my focus is not partisan, and you know that. I first began to raise a fuss about Somalia when President Bush committed our troops last December. And I believe, at least concerning the Secretary of Defense point of view, that we have not had cooperation in getting the information. So while I am disappointed that we will not be calling the Secretary of Defense, and I feel we are not fulfilling our responsibility in that regard, I certainly respect your position. While I disagree with your response, I appreciate your promptness and your frankness.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I appreciate very much your thoughts and words. And I would say that it is also a question of appropriateness. I think if the Armed Services Committee asked the Secretary of State to appear before them, that would be a little out of their jurisdiction, and that is part of the thinking that I had. But I appreciate very much your interest. And you are quite right, you have been concerned about what goes on in Somalia for longer than many of us. Thank you.

Senator BROWN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I did have some questions for the Secretary of State.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BROWN. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate your coming and I hope the questions that have been raised about your appearance here are not misinterpreted either by you or for others who might listen. As you know, the concern in this committee was your canceling out of an appearance that we had been advised had been scheduled. In addition, there was a feeling of some urgency, by many of

our members, because of the rapidly unfolding events. Furthermore, there were reports that other activities that seemed much less important, occupied your schedule.

I want you to know, nonetheless, that we appreciate your responsiveness and your follow up. And, indeed, the accolades that you have heard from the committee are widely felt.

I did want to offer this observation, with regard to President Aristide. As you are well aware, there have been printed public reports questioning his mental stability, questioning his involvement in human rights abuses. As a matter of fact, those have actually been detailed in, I believe, our State Department reports.

While I can appreciate that you do not want to discuss confidential information or classified information in public, it does seem to me that before we commit U.S. troops to assist Aristide to regain power, these concerns are legitimate ones and need to be addressed. Whether it is in this forum or other public forums, the American people need to know if these reports are accurate or not, especially if we are going to go to war and risk our troops' lives.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, let me say a couple of things. First, I appreciate your comment about my attendance. I did ask to have canceled an appearance here. It was on either the day or 2 days before I was getting ready to leave for a 7-day trip to the former Soviet Union. I was urgently trying to get ready and, frankly, I thought it might be more useful if I appeared after I returned rather than at that time. I thought I might have more to offer, and I have tried to provide some of that today.

But I want to emphasize to you, Senator, what I said before, and that is I hope you will call me and not hesitate to ask me to come up to your office or whatever. I looked through my calling records, and I could not find a single instance in which you had called me during the 9 months I have been in office. My recollection is a little different than that; I think we talked one time.

But in any event, the point I want to make is I am available to you. I am not just available to the majority members. I am available to any member of the committee, and I hope you will call so we can touch on matters. I know that the formal hearings have a certain place, but I do enjoy contact with the committee members and I hope you will call.

On the other points you raise, I do agree with you that the American people deserve to be fully informed as to our decisionmaking with respect to the support of President Aristide. I have told you, I think, all I feel free to say in an open session.

That is that, first, I came into office with the prior administration having supported President Aristide, despite some contrary information about him. We looked at the matter. We began to meet with him. I met with him several times myself, at least two times, and talked with him on the telephone. Other members of the administration met with him. And so we have to feed those personal impressions in along with these charges and countercharges that have been made.

But I could not agree more that the American people are entitled to the fullest exposition of this. I am just not in a position to go beyond what I have said here today, that my own judgment, based upon the contacts that I have had, the contacts my colleagues have

had, my watching his performance, as well as studying all this other mass of information, that he is worthy of our support. But if there can be found some way to more fully inform the American people, I would support that. I am not—I am rather helpless on this subject, because what I know in that regard is highly classified and I have got a lot of respect for that classification.

Senator BROWN. I understand. I appreciate your response. And I think you also, perhaps, appreciate the point I tried to make with regard to the heightened interest with regard to potential U.S. involvement.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I do.

Senator BROWN. Mr. Secretary, I, for one, and I suspect others, are concerned about our potential involvement in Bosnia. And as I understand it, we, as a country, have made representations that we would participate with up to 25,000 troops should a peace agreement be achieved there. U.S. troops would be involved in the enforcement of an agreement, should it come to pass.

In earlier testimony by members of the Defense Department and State Department, I was unable to get assurances that if U.S. forces were deployed, and were attacked, that we could be assured that we would go after the people who attacked them. And I would like to renew that question. If American forces are sent to Bosnia in a peacekeeping effort and they are attacked by Serbian forces, will we bomb the supply depots of the Serbs, will we cut off the bridges where they bring in the arms that attack our troops? Can we be assured the United States will do all it can to protect those troops?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I assure you we will do all we can to protect those troops. I would not think of recommending that we go into Bosnia without rules of engagement that permitted our forces to respond—all of our forces to respond. I do not want to get into any—you know, give away a particular operational thing that we will bomb here or bomb there, but I tell you that if American forces go into Bosnia, they will only go under rules of engagement that enable them to be protected. At least, I would never recommend otherwise.

Senator BROWN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Senator Jeffords.

Senator JEFFORDS. Good morning, Mr. Secretary. It is a pleasure to have you here.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. First, I want to reinforce Senator Simon's comments about Africa. And I am especially concerned about the Development Fund. I do support the fact that you are giving Africa a priority of a sense there.

I would like to switch more to a broader question that I do not think has been suggested yet, and that is that the administration has articulated a policy of greater reliance upon multilateral mechanisms for taking care of problems around the world and maintenance of international security.

One of the great problems I see developing, however, in the U.S. foreign policy is a lack of public support for the U.N. and its role in international peacekeeping, peacemaking, and conflict resolu-

tion. This comes, in part, from the many inefficiencies and inadequacies of the U.N., I recognize. I agree that these must be addressed before the U.N. will be capable of doing the tasks to which we would like to see it assigned.

But developing public support for the U.N. takes a commitment on the part of the administration for public education and dedication of time and resources to explain why that can be of value to us in the future. I am concerned, for instance, that a simple signal would be to urge or seek or do something about full funding of the U.N. from our commitments for it, which we have not made.

I also think that we have many ways in which we can demonstrate, hopefully, to the public that for the future—not necessarily the distant future, but also the immediate future, that the support for the U.N. and international involvement will have real positive benefits to this Nation. The ability to enhance our trade and hopefully result in less military involvement around the world and less foreign aid, et cetera.

I just do not see that there has been any real effort by the administration, recognizing that they are dominated right now by domestic problems. But it seems to me we have to build up support for our actions. Right now, I think the polls are still 2 to 1 against any kind of involvement outside of immediate national security.

I wondered what you have in mind to try and turn that public attitude, which is very very dangerous to all of us as far as world peace and our Nation's economic security go?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I agree with you. There is a real danger that there may be a wave of isolationism that comes from the concern about our participation in some of these events. We must not lose sight of the fact that in many instances working through the U.N. enables us to accomplish things of much greater effectiveness than we would be if we tried to do it alone. Just look at some of the principal cases where U.N. resolutions are very important to us: Iraq, Libya, Haiti, and in Bosnia itself the resolutions placing sanctions on Serbia are important.

So that is only one of the many instances where doing things together with other nations is significant. On the other hand, I think we need to recognize that the American people will always be concerned if American troops are involved, if they are not under the operational command of American military leaders.

So I think we need to be able to educate in terms of the importance of the U.N. and the importance of working with other nations, and at the same time recognize that the American people need to have reassurance that if American troops are involved in a combat role, that they will be led by Americans. I think that is the key to it, Senator, and I do think that we need to get through this period without endangering the public reputation of the U.N., and then seek to rebuild confidence in the U.N.

President Clinton's speech at the U.N. had many passages about the need to reform some U.N. procedures. That was a portion of the speech that is unusual, and talking about those kinds of efforts do not get very much public attention. But much work needs to be done there. I think that is another key to improving public opinion with respect to the U.N.; that is trying to dispel these stories that there is maladministration there by correcting the administration.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, I would hope, also, that certainly we can get into lessons of the past and what happens when we have an isolationist approach. Some recall after World War I, and all of those kind of things, because to me we have to give a positive feeling to the people of this country that economically it is going to be to their advantage to do this, or some reason other than being a hero to the world nations. We have to show that our self-interest and improving our standard of living, all those things are connected with our ability to be able to be out in the world.

I think we need a real education program. We are seeing that in NAFTA now. Why this is going to be a negative impact on my people in my State, and why should I support NAFTA? The same feeling is out there for everything, and it is a very disturbing thing for me. And I just urge the administration to be much more positive in making people understand why it is to our advantage to do these things.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Take two areas, Senator, the population area and the environmental area. Those are two areas where we will never be effective if we try to act alone. We really need to work through other countries.

To give you another example, quite a different one that comes to mind, look how important coalitions are in saving us money. The war, Desert Storm effort on our part was virtually all reimbursed by other countries because we worked through a coalition. So it would be very unfortunate to overlearn the lesson of this period. It is very important for us to work with other nations when we can do so compatible with our own national interests.

Senator JEFFORDS. Let me turn now to a more specific question, the Chinese missile sanction, and the concern that I have about what the administration is going to do with respect to defining what will be a sanction and the probable or possible exclusion of the satellite, the weather satellite aspects as being excluded from the sanctions. It seems to me that that would really make very ineffective the sanctions.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, as I understand MTCR, the missile technology control regime, it has rigorous definitions as to what can be included and what is to be excluded. And I think we will be very careful not to make available any equipment that will compromise our security or, indeed, any equipment that keeps those sanctions from being effective.

Senator, it is a highly technical area, and one in which I do not purport to be an expert, but I have talked to our experts within the last few days, trying to make sure that our sanctions will be effective as well as to ensure that we do not make available equipment or technology that will be against our interests.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, I think it is more of a question of whether or not it will be effective as far as being a real detriment, to indicate the seriousness of the situation of the actions of China, rather than any security or aspects of that as far as our technology goes. It is just that it would undercut any effectiveness of the sanctions against those weapons transfers to China.

Finally, with Burundi, I would like to focus on Africa just for a moment. A small country which suffered, as you know, a coup by military officers ending a very brief period of democratic leadership

there, with the murder of the President and widespread killing. What is the United States doing to assist the countries of the region and in trying to deal with the flood of refugees? And are we working with the Organization of African Unity and regional governments to end the ethnic strife and support a return to democracy in Burundi?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, we read the reports from our Ambassador and others there. We are concerned about the situation.

We have been in touch with the Organization of African Unity, as well as the leaders of countries adjacent to Burundi. We think that they should be given a primary opportunity to try to be effective in that situation; but it is a terrible situation, creating the usual refugee flows.

I can only tell you that we have given that lots of attention in the State Department. I think our present evaluation is that the best solution to this, as it so often is, is to work through the regional organization and try to energize it.

We have also made available—I cannot remember the figures, Senator, and will furnish it to you—funds from our very dwindling supplies, to try to assist in the refugee situation.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Coverdell.

Senator COVERDELL. Good morning, Mr. Secretary. It is good to see you again.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Good morning, Senator Coverdell.

Senator COVERDELL. I would just say very quickly that I share the Secretary's concern about classified information; and have not been altogether pleased, as a Member of the Senate, about the manner in which some of the information has been distributed.

I would like to pursue several questions that originated in our hearing with Ambassador Albright, and that relate to the statement that Senator Kerry mentioned.

When you talk about definition, learning and the importance of this period of the post-cold war, I think it is very, very important. We almost hang on the various nuances of statements that are being made by various members of the administration; and I ask, I read a statement by Morton Halperin, who is the administration's designate for Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democracy and Peacekeeping.

First let me ask, this is a new Department for the Department of Defense, and it seems to have an overlap with your venue. Have you been advised on this new Department, and is there a vehicle of coordination with it? Or—

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, Secretary Aspin has decided to try to organize his Department so as to reflect a number of the President's priorities. There is no reason why there should be an exclusivity about pursuing matters as important as democracy. And so I think that one of the responsibilities that assistant secretaryship will have is the pursuit of democracy. You can see the importance of that in the funds that the Defense Department has to expend for peacekeeping purposes, as well as for other purposes.

I do not know Mr. Halperin myself, but I understand that he has been nominated for that position.

Senator COVERDELL. Thank you. I read this quote from Mr. Halperin, which was made in, I think, the summer of this year, to the Ambassador. I will share it with you.

He said that the United States "should explicitly surrender the right to intervene unilaterally in the internal affairs of other countries, by overt military means or by covert operations. Such self-restraint would bar interventions like those in Grenada and Panama, unless the United States first gained the explicit consent of the international community, acting through the Security Council or a regional organization."

I asked Ambassador Albright if she shared this view. She said she did not. And I asked the same question of Secretary Slocombe, who said he did not. And I wondered, you have probably been told of this statement?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, I have not been told of it; but nor do I.

Senator COVERDELL. Well, we now are three for three, and I am very pleased at that. It is very important to clarify this, because this is the kind of thing—and in responding to your question from Senator Jeffords, you were speaking to a problem that I think has undermined some of our hopes for the U.N.

This is my second question. It is in this definitional that I remain very, very interested. You said, we strongly support, and that word has come up repeatedly, interaction. "We strongly support the work of the U.N.'s War Crimes Tribunal, and continued economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro."

And I was reading in a—I have noticed with increasing frequency, statements like this. This is from Madame Albright. "Governments," she went on, "will—will be obliged to hand over for trial those indicted, who are within their jurisdiction." Persons in some other State. "If they refuse, the States may be subject to sanction, and the indicted will become international pariahs."

There is a lot of difference—let me mention another one that I noted here. This is on November 1, from U.N. Special Envoy Dante Caputo, on the issue that has been talked about a great deal here. He warned "that an attempt to oust Aristide from office would be a flagrant violation of the internationally mandated transition to democracy," and he said it would "trigger a complete U.N. commercial embargo."

There is considerable discussion that the change in the mission in Somalia was driven, in large part—I know it is very controversial—was driven in large part by the U.N. agenda. We are beginning to hear almost a tone of sovereignty from the U.N. itself, statehood.

And I wondered if you would comment on the nuances that are very different, between "support" and language, "will" and "mandate" and "subject," "implement"?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, Senator, it is easier for me, perhaps, to do that with some specificity, rather than generality.

Take the War Crimes Tribunal. I believe deeply in the importance of establishing international standards of justice. And, if the War Crimes Tribunal is created as it has been by the U.N., subject

to a vote of the nations of the U.N., then I think the countries that are committed to that process are committed to follow through on it. And, once the U.N. has adopted the War Crimes Tribunal, it needs to have the kind of sanction of the countries that supported it.

So, if a country is a part of that regime, and they are harboring somebody that the War Crimes Tribunal wants to call to account, then I think the country involved is really in a position of needing to support the regime set up by the War Crimes Tribunal.

I find that quite a different thing than, in some way, surrendering any sovereignty to the U.N. I am very much opposed to the United States surrendering its sovereignty. As I said earlier, my job is the protection of the American interests.

I think that we need to preserve our right to take unilateral action. We need to preserve our right to protect our interests as we define them ourselves, with the help of Congress.

So, although the U.N. has a very important role, as I said in the conversation with Senator Jeffords, because it so often enables us to do some things that we cannot do ourselves at all, nevertheless I do not in any way want to give support to the notion that the United States would be surrendering its right to take actions to protect its own vital interests.

Senator COVERDELL. I think these comments that you are making are very, very important, and will go a long way toward easing some of the tensions as they are know, that are developing in the country about just exactly what our relations are with the U.N.

Very quickly, one last question: Are you familiar with this? The minority leader has raised questions about the denial of food and medicine in Bosnia; and has called on the GAO for a report on that. Is there any light that you can shed on that question that has come up just today?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, I am sorry, Senator. I did not see the question. But we will give you a report on that, as soon as we have had a chance to analyze it.

Senator COVERDELL. I appreciate that very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Senator Gregg.

Senator GREGG. Am I the end of the line?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator GREGG. Well, good afternoon, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

Senator GREGG. I certainly appreciate your patience, Mr. Secretary, and the diplomacy of your answers; and I can understand why you are serving in the position you are, from having sat through this long morning. You are so courteous.

I would like to ask a series of questions and I would hope that, to the extent possible, you could answer them sort of in a yes or no framework.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I will try.

Senator GREGG. I recognize that that may be difficult, considering your training and your present position. But it is my natural tendency, being from New England, to be terse and to the point, I guess.

A number of people on the other side, I guess Senator Kerry and Senator Wofford, have said, that, to quote Senator Kerry's words,

that they perceive the CIA, not "perceive," they "feel the CIA or members within the CIA are pursuing a separate foreign policy, their own foreign policy." Do you feel that that is the case? Yes? No?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I have no information and no basis to make an evaluation on that, one way or the other, Senator.

Senator GREGG. How much is it costing us, how much is the total cost to date in Somalia, including direct and indirect costs? Have you a number on that?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, I do not. We will certainly furnish that to you.

When we came into office, Senator, there were almost 26,000 American troops there. I know, from other estimates that I have heard, how much it takes to array that many forces that far away; that it is a very expensive endeavor. As I say, it was at its high point the day we took office.

Senator GREGG. Do you anticipate that it would be the American position that, if you felt you could reach a total settlement in the Middle East with Syria and Israel's other neighbors, that it would be an American position that the Golan Heights should be returned?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, it would not be an American position. That needs to be worked out between the parties, Senator. I am doing my best to shorten this answer. That is not subject to a yes or no answer.

Senator GREGG. I cannot understand why. [Laughter.]

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. We are trying to facilitate those talks; we are acting as a intermediary when the parties ask us. But we do not have a position on that very sensitive issue.

Senator GREGG. Do you feel that the election, the recent Jerusalem election, where there now is mayor of Jerusalem who has said, and campaigned on the position, that he would in no circumstances tolerate being anything other than part of Israel, and being governed as part of Israel, that that is going to slow the peace process there?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Prime Minister Rabin himself indicated yesterday that he did not think it was a favorable development. But I have confidence that there is momentum behind the peace process and that, based upon what I hear of Israeli public opinion, they want to pursue the peace process; and that election should not be read in a way to impede it.

Senator GREGG. On another subject, and this I recognize is going to come from a New England perspective and therefore, right field—

Senator DODD. Speak for yourself. [Laughter.]

Senator GREGG. Well, those parts that we still consider New England. [Laughter.]

Senator DODD. That is Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Senator SARBANES. It is going from bad to worse here. [Laughter.]

Senator GREGG. If the party Quebecois, or the bloc Quebecois, pursues its course, which is the separation of Quebec from Canada, and does it in a framework of the Dominion separating under an

agreement, would you expect the United States to recognize Quebec?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I would not be in favor of a breakup of Canada; and I do not want to try to answer a hypothetical question. Because I think that the United States believes there is great advantage in continued, continuation of Canada in its present form. Obviously, this is the decision for the Canadians to make. If they make it, we will act in accordance with international law.

But as I say, my own feeling is that the Canadians are, it is a wonderful country as it is; and I do not want to try to answer a hypothetical question as to what our recognition policy would be, looking down the line toward a result that I hope will not happen.

Senator GREGG. Well, that was not yes or no, but it was diplomatically accurate, and I appreciate it.

On another area, if you look at Georgia and Azerbaijan and Armenia as a group, and all the other separate, all the other Republics in that region, do we have a policy that is uniquely directed at that region of the world, other than that we want to see democracy survive?

I mean, each of those nations appears to be subdividing within subdivisions, into ethnic differences. Do we have a stated policy as to which nations we will step into, when we will step into them, and why we will step into them, amongst those, amongst that arc that appears to be such a force for disarray within that part of the world, and that is drawing a lot of other parts of the world into it?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, we do not have any one, overarching policy with respect to all of them. We support the territorial integrity and independence of all the new independent states, but I do not think you or other Members of the Congress would want to have us, have a commitment to intervene or act in connection with those countries, on some hypothetical basis. We will have to judge each one of them as they come up.

But it is a long, long ways from the United States, and we would have to define whether or not we had sufficient vital interests to be involved there; and we would have to ask a lot of very hard questions.

Senator GREGG. That should be the test, should it not? That there is a vital American interest, prior to getting involved in nations like, that have those deep ethnic problems and deep religious problems?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Absolutely. And—absolutely.

Senator GREGG. What do you see happening, on another issue, with the religious confrontation that is occurring in India, and the potential that that has, for being a conflict of proportions so immense that it would dwarf the proportions of Bosnia or anything else that is going on in the world right now?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Well, religious conflicts seem to have a quality of emotion and sustained violence about them that exceeds almost anything else in the world. And I only hope and pray, for India, that they will find some way to quiet the emotions there that seem to be fueling the situation. It would certainly be a tragic step backward for that country to not accommodate, in a very positive way, the minority religions.

That is a worldwide problem, Senator, that we seem to have lost, so many countries, the capacity to deal sensitively with minorities. Here in the United States, we are so fortunate that we have grown up with a sense of realizing the contribution that is made by our minorities all over this country. But other countries seem to be going in the opposite direction, of a failure to be sensitive to minorities in their country, and recognize how much they contribute to their country.

Senator GREGG. I appreciate that. I think that is absolutely true. Does the State Department have an assessment of what the present Indian situation or status is, as to their capacity to handle this? This conflict predates, obviously, their independence. It was part of the Kashmir issue at the time of their independence.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. I would like to arrange for you to have a briefing, or to call you myself, to give you an up-to-date assessment. I have been reading the reports on it, but I do not know exactly where we would predict it will go from here.

Senator GREGG. Were you familiar with the—my time is about up, but let me ask you—were you familiar with the on-the-ground situation that occurred when these 18 American troops were killed, and the 78 were wounded, in Somalia? How long they were on the ground, and what the back pattern was that led to their death?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, it was a military operation, Senator. I saw reports of it afterward, but it was a military operation and it was being supervised by others than the State Department, obviously.

Senator GREGG. In any of the reports that you saw—there have been representations that the primary reason that the deaths occurred, and that the casualties were so high, was that the people on the ground were not resupplied, and did not, ran out of ammunition. In any of the reports that you saw, was that a factor that was cited?

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. No, Senator. But I want to be careful on this. That is out of the area of my principal responsibility, and I am not a student of those after-action reports. I really think that question needs to be directed elsewhere.

Senator GREGG. Well, we would like to, but we have not had a chance to speak to others. Thank you very much. I appreciate your patience for sitting here for almost 4 hours. I appreciate that.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator GREGG. Three hours, I guess.

The CHAIRMAN. It is still, "Good afternoon," not "Good evening." [Laughter.]

I would just like to emphasize my support of the comments by Senators Dodd and Kerry regarding Haiti. Our objective, our concern here is not with individuals; it is for the promotion of democracy and human rights in that country.

And, just as one Senator, I would like to go on record as not supporting the concept of sending half the troops into Bosnia, if that ever occurred. I think the ratio should not be more than 1 out of 5. Just a personal view.

I would turn now to Senator Kassebaum.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Mr. Secretary, I hate to prolong this, but I did want to raise something.

Because, one—I, like many others here, as a strong supporter of the North American Free Trade Agreement, I was pleased to see your No. 1 priority was the strong economies that you feel are important.

But I have become—and trade policy is not really, you are not the trade negotiator—but it is something that cuts across many lines in the administration; and I am increasingly troubled by what seems to me some real inconsistencies in our trade policy.

On the one hand, we are pursuing free trade with Mexico; and yet we are cutting side deals, which really impose barriers. I do not have sugar in my State, or peanuts, or citrus fruit—and I realize how important it is to get votes for the North American Free Trade Agreement—but I think this can have repercussions on our negotiations in the Uruguay Round.

And I think that it is terribly important for us to be able to try and delineate, again, a consistent trade policy that—I realize consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds—but I think that, when we are wanting others to give up trade barriers and subsidies, we have to be able to deal with it from the standpoint of being able to practice it ourselves. And I just would like to send that message.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator. You have.

Senator KASSEBAUM. And one other thing, and again, because of the message it sends, I was a little surprised to see in your statement regarding China, "The clock is ticking on next spring's decision on MFN renewal." And this, "Unless there is overall significant progress on human rights, the President will not be in a position to recommend extension."

Again, that is a significant threat. We are all concerned about human rights. But we do not, we want to be careful we do not get into a box, from which it may be difficult to have the President actually take that position.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, those words were not ones that originated with me late last night. Those words are drawn from the President's statement, when he extended MFN for another year and said that it would only be extended further, if that test was met. So I was really just parroting the President's own statement on it. That does not break any new ground.

Senator KASSEBAUM. And I realize that. But again, I guess it is a word of caution, that I think we have to be careful and do, do what we say we are going to do, if indeed that is something that we said. Thank you very much.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I will recognize Senator Dodd.

Senator DODD. Very quickly. Mr. Secretary, I commend you for your responses today. First, I want to underscore the issue, the Peace Corps issue, that has been raised by Senator Wofford.

Senator Coverdell and I, along with others, have sent a letter on October 4 to the administration, regarding the Peace Corps' presence in Russia. There were about 25 or 30 members of the Senate who were on that letter. I will not go into it now; I would just bring your attention to it.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you.

Senator DODD. The second matter is, I recently spent a couple of days, as you know, in Nicaragua. I met with a broad spectrum of political elements in that country.

I must tell you, I am not—there has not been the kind of significant, and I use the words carefully, significant progress that I would have hoped, in a number of areas that have been raised in the past with the administration. There has been some progress, on a couple of important areas.

Rather than ask you to respond to this right now, let me just that if, I would recommend that we release the funds that have been authorized and appropriated, although I am not as satisfied as I would like to be. But I do not know of any other alternative, at this particular point.

We have 60 percent unemployment in that country, and a birth rate of 3.8 percent, the highest in the world. It is tragic and sad, what has happened; that the political elements in that country that achieved election only a few years ago, seem unwilling or unable to come together on some questions they should be able to resolve amongst themselves.

Again, if someone said to me, "Are you entirely happy?" The answer is no. But I do not have much of another choice for you at this juncture, than to try and do what we can to see if we can buy some time, so those elements may come together.

That will not be universally endorsed, what I am recommending, but I have no other recommendation to give you; and I would ask you to take a look at that.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Thank you, Senator. We appreciate very much your commitment to inter-American issues, and the contribution that you have made on a number of issues like that. So I appreciate your advice on that.

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We are about to wrap up, and I see the Senator from Virginia has arrived. Do you have a particularly burning question?

Senator ROBB. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would inquire as to whether the Secretary has had an opportunity to respond on questions with respect to the IAEA deadline that passed on Pyongyang; and whether or not the State Department had any particular comment on the positions expressed by Japan and South Korea, on our inactivity in response to that?

If that has been covered, I apologize. I have been over in a conference on the Defense authorization bill, and on the crime bill on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Parts of it have been and parts of it have not been covered.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, I am glad to see you and I would be glad to talk with you about it if you want to.

Senator ROBB. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask for one brief comment on that question? I will not extend the hearing and I apologize.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Not at all.

Senator ROBB. I was concerned that the hearing might have concluded before I got here and I was going to respond for the record.

Mr. Secretary, there is concern, as you know, with respect to the negotiations that have been taking place, and Secretary Gallucci and others have been attempting to resolve this particular question. There is a great deal of concern over the failure of the North Koreans, in this particular instance, to observe the deadline for the replacement of batteries and film and what have you with respect to the monitoring devices, and no progress at all with respect to the special inspections that have been called for, and advice from our allies in South Korea as well as from Japan that we continue to delay taking any activity that would involve sanctions and what have you.

And I would be pleased with any response that you might give on that question, and how this would impact our relationships with others like Libya and others who might view what they might regard as vacillation in this area.

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Senator, the situation with North Korea is a very delicate one at the present time. Hans Blix, the Director of the IAEA, has given a report as you know in which he said that the continuity of safeguards had not been broken even though he was disappointed by the lack of the inspection opportunities that he wanted.

If he were to so conclude, that is that the continuity of safeguards had been broken, then I would think we would have no choice but to go to the U.N. and seek sanctions. But while he continues to hold out the possibility and the hope that they will permit inspections before that continuity is broken, I think we will pursue that course, and we are being strongly urged to pursue that course by the neighboring countries that have the most at stake, as you know, South Korea and Japan.

We are following that on an almost hourly basis because of our concern about the situation and the desire that we have. They assure us that there are inspection procedures that would let us know what is being developed in that country.

I do not think I can say much more than that, Senator. We depend very highly on the expert ability of IAEA and they, may I say, have indicated that the safeguard regime continuity has not been broken. Until that happens I think that we would not be in a position to seek sanctions. Sanctions, as I said before in this very forum, will be difficult but not impossible.

Senator ROBB. Mr. Secretary, I recognize that you cannot go into any detail or specificity in an open forum, but are you confident that the, "continuity can be monitored with sufficient accuracy," I guess that is the way I ought to say it in this forum, "to allow us to make that judgment?"

Secretary CHRISTOPHER. Relying very heavily on the expert judgment of Mr. Blix, I think that we feel there has been no compromise yet of the regime, but we are getting very close.

Senator ROBB. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and I apologize for coming in late.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. The record will stay open until the close of business tomorrow for the receipt of any questions or insertions from my colleagues.

And I congratulate the Secretary on his excellent statement and activity here, and turn now to Senator Sarbanes for a sad duty that he has.

Senator SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, it is with very great sadness that I report to the committee the death this morning of Marcia Verville, who served for almost 7 years with great distinction on the staff of this committee. Previously she had worked for a decade and a half for our colleague, Senator Eagleton.

There is much important legislation that was shaped by Marcia Verville in the course of her work here and elsewhere in the Senate, and our Nation's values and interests have been enhanced by her efforts for more than 20 years as a very able staff person in the Senate.

It was a privilege to have worked with her. She was unmatched in her dedication and effectiveness, and admired and respected by all. I know we all join in sending our profound sympathies to her husband, Dick, her daughter, Alexandra, and the other members of her family.

And, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that when the committee adjourns today, it do so in memory of and tribute to Marcia Verville.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Sarbanes, that will be done, and we adjourn in memory of Marcia Verville.

[Whereupon, at 1:12 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05982 097 5

ISBN 0-16-043362-2



90000

9 780160 433627